

THE EVANGELICAL REVIEW.

NO. XLV.

JULY, 1860.

ARTICLE I.

MELANCHTHON ON THE DIVINE NATURE.

Translated from the "*Loci Communes*."

NOTE.—This translation has been made from the text of the *Loci Communes* by Bretschneider, edited by Bindseil, in volumes XXI and XXII of the CORPUS REFORMATORUM, 1854, collated with Detzer's edition, and the text of Chemnitz's *Loci Theologici*, Wittenberg 1723, and the German translation by Justus Jonas, printed by Seitz, 1537.

MAN was created, and afterwards redeemed, that he might be an image and temple of God for his Maker's praise. For it is the wish of God to be known and glorified; and if human nature had remained uncorrupted, a bright and abiding knowledge of the Deity would illuminate the minds of men; nor is there a greater or better work for man, since Adam and Eve were received into favor, than to acknowledge, invoke, and praise God, as said in Psalm 149: 1—"Praise ye the Lord, sing his praise in the congregation of the saints." Also in Psalm 118: 17—"I shall not die, but live, and declare the works of the Lord." It is, therefore, the first and chief concern of man to apply himself to the true doctrine concerning God, as the first commandment also particularly demands. But the minds of men, in the present corruption of nature, wander in great and sad uncertainty, questioning whether there is a God or Providence, and what the will of God is. Though, that there is a God, and that he demands obedience according to the distinction between good and evil stamped upon the human mind, and that he justly punishes

atrocious crimes with direful inflictions in this life, is apparent from many clear and inflexible evidences, still there is great misgiving and mental torture, arising from the fact that often both the good and bad are alike oppressed with calamity and misfortunes.

And even when the human mind knows that God punishes the guilty, it can have no knowledge of the forgiveness of sins, except by the revelation of the Gospel. Therefore, when weighed down with afflictions, men either regard them as occurring by chance, or wonder why God burdens this frail nature with such great miseries. Pericles supposed the Attic pestilence to spring chiefly from chance, or from some natural infection, and knew not that it was a divine punishment. Oedipus knew himself to be punished of God, but understood nothing about the forgiveness of sins.

Whilst, therefore, the darkness of the human mind is so great, let us learn how vast the blessing is, that God has revealed himself by words and evidences plain and sure, all along from the beginning, ever since man was created, and his church constituted; that he has, by his word, given us the law and the Gospel of reconciliation, and substantiated it by mighty miracles, such as preservation in the deluge, the sending out of Sodom, the leading forth of the people of Israel from Egypt, and many resuscitations of the dead.

By these illustrious testimonies, let us endeavor to find out the revealed God, and separate ourselves from the heathen, and all who are ignorant of the Gospel, and consider in our worship what God we adore, where and why he has made himself known; let us not wander in mind as the heathen, or those who run to idol shrines, nor think carelessly or indifferently concerning God's revelation, but acknowledge it to be a great benefaction, and a sure indication that it is the will of God to help us. Paul, in 1 Cor. 1: 21, thus conducts us to Revelation: "For after that in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe;" that is, because they wandered in mind, and, notwithstanding what they beheld in the beautiful economy of nature, so wisely made, and so clearly reminding us of the great Artificer, still doubted whether there is a providence, whether God does accept, hear, and help us, the word of the Gospel was given, in which God makes himself known, although the larger part of mankind deride it as a fable. Others, however, have received it, and thereby learn to know aright, and to

call upon God as they should, and are blessed with eternal life, righteousness and glory.

In like manner Christ directs us to the revealed God. When Philip asked, "show us the Father," he solemnly rebuked him, and recalled him from his vain imaginings, and said (John 14: 9): "He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father." He is not willing for us to search after God in wild fancies, but intends that we should fix our eyes upon this manifested Son, and direct our worship to that God the eternal Father who has revealed himself by sending this Son, and giving the Gospel, and who, for the sake of this Son, the Mediator, accepts of us, and hears our prayers. Thus God, coming forth from his secret throne for our salvation, and making himself known, and familiarly speaking with us, has continually, from the beginning, delivered some word, and given some testimony, to which he has so bound men's minds, as to assure them that this God who has revealed himself by this word and this testimony, is indeed the eternal Creator. So in the first commandment, he binds the people to the word which was proclaimed on mount Sinai, and to the deliverance from Egypt: "I am the Lord thy God which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage." All the wonderful doings included in the deliverance from Egypt, were evidences of the presence of God. This same God gave the promises of a Mediator, whence the fathers knew from the very beginning, that their prayers were heard. Thus their worship was restricted to that God who had revealed himself in bringing Israel out of Egypt, and had given the promises concerning the Mediator; as David says (109: 1): "The Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou at my right hand. Thou art a priest forever," &c. Thus, then, by the manifested, crucified, and risen Christ, and by the light of the Gospel blazing abroad, let us place before us this testimony itself, and see in this Son, and learn, both who God is, and what is his will towards us, and considerately and earnestly separate our worship from that of the heathen, Turks and Jews. For particularly in two most weighty questions does the true worship differ from the false: the question respecting the Divine *essence*, and the question concerning the Divine *will*. Although the Turks claim to be the worshippers of one God, the Creator of heaven and earth, they nevertheless wander from the true God, because they deny him to be God who sent his Son, the Mediator. They do not, therefore, worship aright; for there is an inflexible

and eternal rule, which says, "He that honoreth not the Son, honoreth not the Father which hath sent him."—John 5: 23. The Turks therefore err, in the first place, concerning the Divine essence, because they imagine to themselves their God, who is not the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

They err, in the second place, with regard to the Divine will. As they are ignorant of the Gospel, and deny that the Son is the Mediator, they remain in perpetual uncertainty, and cannot decide whether they are accepted of God, or whether their prayers are heard. Those who remain in this incertitude, surely do not call upon, but fly from God, and run either into contempt of God, or into eternal despairs and blasphemies.

On the other hand, the Church of God declares him to be God, the Creator of all things, who has manifested himself in the mission of his Son, the gift of the Gospel, and the setting forth of mighty testimonies, which are narrated in the writings of the prophets and Evangelists. She thus judges, in the first place, respecting the Divine essence, not from human imaginings, but from the divine word, delivered and authenticated by infallible attestations. Then, as to God's will towards us, we know to a certainty, that by a marvellous and inscrutable counsel, his Son was made Mediator, and that for this Mediator's sake our prayers are accepted and answered. By considering these differences from the start, which in worship should be daily remembered, we will better understand how to search out, know, and worship God, than from the idle speculations which many have heaped up, pell-mell, in Lombard's Commentaries.

But that we may have some fixed description of God, I will examine two: the inadequate one of Plato, and the perfect one which is taught by the church, and which may be learned from the formula of Baptism. The Platonic description of God is this: *God is an eternal Spirit, the author of good in nature.* But although this Platonic description is so very skillfully framed, that it may be difficult for the inexperienced to detect what it lacks, nevertheless, as it says nothing about God as he has revealed himself, another, more evident, and more appropriate description will be necessary. This statement says that *God is an eternal Spirit;* that is, a spiritual, intelligent, eternal Being; *the author of good in nature;* that is, true, good, just, almighty, the creator of all good things, of the whole economy of nature, and of man for a special service, that is, for a peculiar obedience. All

this is comprehended in Plato. But still, these are only the thoughts of a human mind, which, although true, pertinent, and founded upon mature reasonings, must still have added to them the attributes which God himself has revealed. The other description, therefore, is this :

God is a spiritual essence, intelligent, eternal, true, good, holy, just, merciful, most free, infinite in power and wisdom, the Father eternal, who from eternity begat the Son, his image, and the Son, the image of and co-eternal with the Father, and the Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father and the Son ; for so indeed the Godhead has been revealed by the infallible word, that the Father eternal, together with the Son and the Holy Ghost, created and preserves the heavens, and the earth, and all creatures, and hath selected for himself a church from among men created after his own image, and for a peculiar service, that by it this true and only God, revealed by indubitable testimonies through the word delivered by the prophets and apostles, might be known, adored and worshipped as he is presented in his own holy oracles, and that every form of worship which fancies to itself other gods might be condemned, and the true God glorified for ever and ever.

This description tells more nearly who God is, and leads us to the revealed Godhead, according to what the church in past ages has uniformly taught respecting this doctrine. The first chapter of Genesis testifies that God is an *intelligent* Being. It tells us : "God said ;" but speech belongs to an intelligent being, not to a brute. And that he is a *good* Being, holy, just, and most free, is attested in the creation of man, upon whom, being created in the divine image, God impressed sentiments impelling to everything good, just and orderly, as well as a free will, although these gifts have been greatly marred since the fall of our first parents. And that God is an *eternal and almighty* Being, is proved in the creation itself, concerning which it is said, "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth."

The *three persons*, indeed, although but obscurely intimated in this chapter, are by degrees more clearly revealed. The Father spake, and so begat the word, which is the image of the eternal Father. And concerning the Holy Ghost, it is expressly said, "The Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters." But the doctrine (of the Trinity) was afterwards more clearly revealed to the fathers and prophets. David and Isaiah distinctly place the Messiah above angels

and all creatures, and call him God; as in the second Psalm, "Thou art my son," &c., and Psalm 45: 11, "The king shall greatly desire thy beauty: for he is thy Lord; and worship thou him." Also Isaiah 9: 6, "Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given, and his name shall be called, the mighty God, the Father of eternal life."

At length, in the New Testament, the three persons were the most clearly manifested; as at Christ's baptism, the Father says, "This is my beloved Son;" the Son at the same time stands by the river in sight of all; the Holy Ghost in true visible form alights upon the Son. Looking at the exhibition in this scene, let us separate our ideas of God and our worship from the heathen Turks and Jews, and worship that Father eternal who manifested himself in the mission of Jesus Christ his Son, and the display of the Holy Ghost, together with the Son and Spirit, the one Creator of all things and our helper. These are things which should be often thought of during worship. But in what way the persons are to be distinguished from each other, will be shown hereafter; before we reach that point, however, the remaining part of the description is to be explained.

I have said that the creation was effected by the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. This is taught in various passages of the Old Testament and of the New; as John 1: 3 says of the Word, "All things were made by him." And with regard to the Holy Ghost, it is written, "The Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters." Let the rule therefore be always held as a fixture of the mind, that the creation and preservation of things is the work of the whole Trinity, the Father eternal, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

Finally, our description of God speaks of the church, that our minds may be bound to that God who manifests himself in the church, and be assured that he truly is the Creator of all things, who hath made himself known by the gift of his own word, and by sure testimonies ever since the beginning of the world; and know also that our apprehensions concerning him, must be according as he has revealed himself. The heathen and Turks may boast that they worship that God who made the heavens and the earth; but they boast in what is false, because they wander in mind, and are not willing to pray to him as the Creator who has revealed himself by his word and the sending of his Son. They therefore stray from the real creator, and fancy to themselves Creators

from their own imaginings. Wherefore, in all thoughts concerning God, and in all worship, our minds are to be fixed upon Christ, sent in the flesh, crucified, and raised from the dead, and believe that he is verily the Creator who sent this Son, and gave his Gospel to the Church.

Having briefly gone over the particulars of the description, let us know also, that these excellencies which we hereby ascribe to God, are not accidental in him, as wisdom, justice and goodness are accidental and variable in man or angel; but just as the forbearance of God is not separate from his being, so neither are the other things, the wisdom, truth, justice and goodness of God, but are his very being, which is a certain life, self-subsisting, intelligent, eternal, omnipotent, good and just.

In order that the Church may keep this description of God in constant view, as distinct from the ideas of the heathen, Christ has entrusted it to us in the first and most notable christian rite; as when it is said, "I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;" that is, I hereby testify by the ordinance and command of Christ, that thou art accepted of God, the Creator of all things, the Father eternal, and by his Son, Jesus Christ, and by the Holy Ghost, and know thou that this God is reconciled through Jesus Christ, the Son of the eternal Father, and that in this faith thou art to call upon him, who will direct thee by the Holy Spirit, and quicken thee to everlasting life, just as the divine promises propose: "I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh," &c. And Christ says, in John 14: 16, "I will pray the Father, and he will give you another Comforter, even the Spirit of truth."

Hence, whenever we think of God, either in teaching or in worship, we must place before our minds what baptism testifies upon this doctrine, and not speculate so much concerning the number, but rather devote our attention to the reasons why the Son was sent, to the promise of reconciliation, to the wonderful guidance vouchsafed to the saints, who are defended by Christ against the devil, and marvellously quickened by the Holy Ghost. For although the devil, who is a murderer, assails every one with astonishing subtlety, in order to drive us from God into utter destruction; still Christ fights for his sheep, however weak or full of trouble, as he says, "My sheep hear my voice, and none shall pluck them out of my hand." As often, therefore, as we pronounce the baptismal formula, let us think of the wondrous blessing of God in the gift of his Son.

TESTIMONIES TO THE UNITY OF GOD.

The eternal Divine Being is *One*, according to the given description, the Father eternal, the Son the Father's image, and the Holy Ghost. When the whole Godhead within itself is described, the persons are distinguished; but when placed in opposition with creatures, but one eternal being is mentioned; as in Deut. 6: 4, "Hear O Israel; the Lord our God is one Lord." And the pious ought to mark this designation. I have said that our worship is to be distinguished from the heathen; hence the people of Israel attributed to God the peculiar name *Jehovah*, to distinguish the true Lord and Creator, who revealed himself among this people, from heathen idols and fabled divinities.

Deut. 4: 35.—"Unto thee was it shewed, that thou mightest know that the Lord he is God: there is none else besides him;" that is, this God, revealed among this people of Israel, is the only God." Deut. 32: 39.—"See now that I, even I, am he, and there is no God with me." Isaiah 44: 6.—"Thus saith the Lord, the King of Israel, and his Redeemer, the Lord of hosts; I am the first, and I am the last; and besides me there is no God." Isaiah 45: 5, 21, 22.—"I am the Lord, and there is none else, there is no God beside me; I am the Lord and there is none else. I form the light, and create darkness . . There is no God else beside me; a just God and a Saviour; there is none beside me. Look unto me and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth: for I am God, and there is none else." 1 Cor. 8: 4—6.—"Therefore we know that an idol is nothing in the world, and there is none other God but one. For though there be that are called gods, whether in heaven or in earth, (as there be gods many and lords many;) but to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him." Eph. 4: 6 "One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all."

THE THREE PERSONS OF THE GODHEAD.

In this article, it will be necessary to determine what the word *Person* signifies. First, therefore, I will give that definition which is appropriate to this subject. *A person*, (as the Church uses the word in this article,) is *an individual subsistence, intelligent and incommunicable*. It is well established that the ancient ecclesiastical writers made a dis-

tinction between the two words *οὐσία* and *ἰνορᾶς*, and say that the *οὐσία*, that is, the essence or being of the eternal Father, Son, and Holy Ghost is one; but that there are three *ἰνορᾶς*; that is, three real personalities, not imaginary, not transient, not confounded together, but distinct or individual intelligences. In the place of this word, the Latins use the term *persona*, person. And though the Greek word *ἰνορᾶς* is plain, yet, because the wantonness of supercilious men often obscures correct diction, disputes have arisen concerning it also. The Greeks therefore gave it up, and in imitation of the Latins, also began to speak of three *προτότατα*, *characters*. But passing by the disputes about words, we will adhere faithfully to the decision of the church, and make use of expressions already approved and used in the church without ambiguity. The fanatical man, Servetus, has unwarrantably trifled with the word *persona*, and alleged that among the Latins it formerly meant *character*, or peculiarity of office; as we say, Roscius at one time sustains the character (*personam*) of Achilles, at another time the character (*personam*) of Ulysses; or as we say, the character (*persona*) of a consul is different from that of a slave, as Cicero says, "It is of great importance in a republic to respect the character (*personam*) of a chief or officer." And this old meaning of the word he has adroitly turned over to the article on the three persons of the Godhead. But let us avoid and execrate such irreverent trickery, and know that on this point the church speaks in a different manner, and that *person* means an individual, intelligent, and incommunicable subsistence. And when we consider this subject, it is well for us often to recur to the Saviour's baptism, where the three persons are pointed out in plain distinction from each other. The Father utters his voice, "This is my beloved Son;" the Son is seen standing by the river; and the Holy Ghost descends in visible form. To this exhibition agree those strong passages of the Scripture which tell who and what the Son is, and who and what is the Holy Ghost.

First, therefore, must this description be retained: The Father is an eternal person, not born, but who from eternity begat the Son, his image. The Son is the image of the Father, begotten by the Father from all eternity; who afterwards, at a certain time, assumed human nature in the womb of the virgin Mary, as is said below. The Holy Ghost is the Mover, proceeding from the Father and the Son, and sent to

be the sanctifier of our souls, that is, to kindle new light, righteousness, and life eternal, and acceptable to God, in those who are made heirs of eternal life. There are, then, three persons of the Godhead, infinite, co-eternal, and *μονονοιας* of one and the same nature : the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son, who is called *λόγος*—the Word, the image of the eternal Father ; and the Holy Ghost. Nor are there any more persons of the Godhead than these three.

But although all the minds of angels and men are astounded with wonder at this mystery, that God begat a Son, and that from the Father and the Son proceeds the Spirit, the Sanctifier ; yet, it is necessary so to decide, because, as already said, our perceptions of God must accord with his revelation of himself. The heathen, attempting to find out God by their own imaginings, came to no settled conclusions ; but the Church confesses and acknowledges God, the eternal and almighty Maker, as he has revealed himself. And though we are not permitted to see very deeply into this mystery, it is still the will of God that in this life our worship and what we do know of him, should be distinguished from what is false. He has accordingly propounded, in his word, by infallible testimonies, a revelation, in which we, as the unborn infant in the maternal womb, drawing nutriment from the umbilical vessels, might sit encompassed, and draw knowledge of God, and life from the Divine word, in order to worship him as he has made himself known.

CONCERNING THE SON.

The Son is thus described:—In John 1: 1, he is called *λόγος*, or *word*. In Col. 1: 15, he is called the *image of God*. In Hebrews 1: 3, he is called, *the brightness of God's glory*, the likeness or express image of the Father's person. And that this passage speaks of the Divine nature of the Son, is evident ; for it says, “all things were made by him.” In the Creed, he is called *Light of Light*. The collecting together of these designations makes it appear that the Son is an *image*, and a *λόγος*, or *word*. These designations are taken from other objects as illustrations, and by looking carefully at them, their beauty and meaning will be readily perceived. The Son is called an *image* and a *word*. The image, therefore, is begotten by the Father's thought, just as we (to use a feeble comparison,) take images or patterns from our minds.

For it was the design of God that his likeness should be seen in man; and if human nature had retained its original light and excellence, it would be an undimmed mirror of the Divine nature. But even now, in this darkness, some vestiges may still be traced. It is by the faculty of thinking that the human mind directly pictures or eliminates the image of the thing thought; but we do not transfer our being into those images, which are but suggested thoughts and evanescent operations. But the eternal Father, contemplating himself, begat his thought, which is the image of himself, not shadowy and fleeting, but subsisting by participation in the essence itself.

This image, therefore, is the second person, befitting the names by which he is designated. He is called a *λόγος*, or *word*, because he is begotten by a thought. He is called an *image*, because the thought is the image of the thing thought. He is called the brightness of glory, that is, according to the more significant Greek term *απαρχαομά*—the brightness brought forth from another light. So the Son is the brightness begotten by the light of the Father; just as the Creed says, "Light of Light." Again, he is the image of the Father's person; that is, not a mere shadowy and transient reflection, but living by participating in the essence. As, therefore, in the procreation of human beings, we say the Son is begotten from the father's person, and is like the father, so the second person is called the Son, because he is born from the Father's person, and is his image. The Son is therefore properly distinguished from the other persons, in that he is begotten, and is an image. The distinction will become plainer when we add that this second person once assumed human nature in the virgin Mary. For the Father did not assume human nature; neither did the Holy Ghost assume humanity. The Son only is the Christ; that is, the promised Redeemer, two natures mysteriously united in one person, to wit, that eternal Father's image, the *λόγος*, and humanity. For on this point the church is accustomed to speak of a union of the two in one.

These are wonderful things, far above the grasp of all creatures. But we know that these mysteries have been revealed to the church, that we might worship God aright, and consider the reasons of his wonderful blessing, that God by eternal covenant did join himself to human nature. Surely then he cares for it, and loves it, and has sent this Son to be the Redeemer, and to pacify the wrath against sins, as is to be frequently observed hereafter.

The third person, the Holy Ghost, is said to proceed from the Father and the Son. This peculiarity belongs to this third person. Another peculiarity is, that he is the person sent into the hearts of the regenerate; that is, the person by whom the Father and the Son kindle new light, and awaken new emotions pleasing to God, righteousness and renewed life in men's hearts. And the Holy Spirit is indeed present in our hearts, when he guides, moves and illuminates them; as is said in 1 Cor. 3: 6, "Ye are the temple of God, and the Spirit of God dwelleth in you." This direction and sanctification is called the peculiar work of God. But as the Son is born from the thought, so the Holy Ghost proceeds from the will of the Father and the Son. For it appertains to the will to move and to love; just as it is not the heart of man that begets images or likenesses, but the spirit or soul.

TESTIMONIES.

Matt. 28: 19.—"Baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." In this passage the three persons are enumerated by name, and equal power and honor is attributed to them. For it was the intention of the Saviour to embrace a summary of the Gospel in this first ordinance. And he hereby, at the same time, testified that we are accepted of God, and teaches who God is, what God we are to worship, and what he bestows upon us. "I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;" that is, I testify that thou art accepted by the eternal Father, by the Son, and by the Holy Ghost, that by their mercy and power thou mightest be delivered from sin and eternal death, and obtain righteousness and eternal life. Thou shalt therefore worship, not as the heathen, who abjure the true and revealed God, but with the confident assurance that he is the Creator of all things, who from the beginning has revealed himself in his word and sure testimonies, and has made with thee a covenant in baptism, declaring himself to be the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to have ordained his Son to be the Mediator, and to have sent the Holy Spirit in order to commence righteousness and eternal life in thee.

Know thou that in the formula of baptism the substance of the Gospel is compendiously embraced, and instruction furnished as to who is God. "I baptize thee in the name of;" that is, in the worship and by the command, also for

the acknowledgment and adoration of "the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost." Over thee I invoke the Father, Son and Spirit, testifying that thou art accepted, and that thy prayers shall be heard. This is what is expressed in the words of baptism.

Whilst then these words declare the Father to be God, to be the almighty, and to be worshipped, and admit the Son and Holy Ghost to an equal share of this honor, the power and dignity of each must needs be equal. And as the power is the same, they are *ουσιοι*—of one and the same nature. More than this, it is established that the Father, and Christ the Son, are distinct persons. Hence the name of the Holy Ghost also signifies a distinct person. For if the Holy Ghost means only the Father himself as the motor and mover of things, he would be twice named, which would be vain tautology. According to this way of thinking, Basil also argues from this utterance of Christ with much sagacity and force, that the Father, Son and Holy Ghost are of one and the same Divine essence. "We must be baptized, as Christ has commanded us to be; but we must believe according to our baptism; and we must worship as we believe; therefore, we must worship the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost."

But as the proof-texts on this subject are scattered here and there in the writings of the prophets and apostles, some of which speak only of the Son, and others only of the Holy Spirit, we will first collect those which relate to the Son. The principal proof, however, is in the first chapter of John, who, as some say, wrote his Gospel because Ebion, and afterwards Cerinthus, had disseminated Jewish errors, and denied to Christ a Divine nature, imagining that he was but a man.

But before I come to John, I will first present two important scriptural arguments, which, in my judgment, are useful for instruction, and consoling to the pious. First, it must be confessed that Christ is, by nature, the Son of God, because the Gospel distinguishes the sons of adoption from the Son, Christ; for John calls Christ the "only begotten Son;" 1 : 14; "We beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father." Besides, if he is the Son by nature, undoubtedly there must needs be a Divine nature substantially in him. But whatever embracing a Divine nature, is beyond the person of the Father, must needs be a person. Thus Paul says of Christ, "In him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily;" Col. 2 : 9. That is, he who is the Christ is a Divine person; as though he had said, the God-

head resides in him, not only influentially and separably, as in David, but so that the very *ὑπόστασις* of Christ is Divine. For the Greeks use the word *σώμα*, as we commonly use the word *person*.

The second argument is this: All the Scriptures, both prophetic and apostolic, with great unanimity, instruct us to worship and pray to Christ, and command us to fix our trust in him. They therefore ascribe to him infinite power; assume that he is everywhere present, that he looks into the heart, hears prayer, and bestows righteousness and eternal life. Of necessity, therefore, there is in Christ a Divine nature.

Perspicuous are the clear evidences concerning prayer to and trust in Christ. "Matt. 11: 28; "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." John 3: 36: "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life." Isaiah 11: 10; "And in that day there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people, to it shall the Gentiles seek." Ps. 45: 11; "So shall the King greatly desire thy beauty; for he is thy Lord, and worship thou him." Ps. 72: 5 sqq. "They shall fear thee as long as the sun and moon endure—prayer also shall be made before him continually." Acts 7: 57; "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." 1 Thes. 3: 11; "Now God himself and our Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ, direct our way unto you." 2 Thes. 2: 16; "Now our Lord Jesus Christ himself, and God, even our Father, which hath loved us, and hath given us everlasting consolation and good hope through grace, comfort your hearts." Gen. 48: 16; "The God of Abraham, and the angel which redeemeth me from all evil, bless the lads."

In these and such like texts, it is asserted that Christ has ever and anon been invoked, even when there was no visible presence or intercourse with men. This worship cannot therefore be taken, as the Jews contend, as a mere mark of respect, such as that shown in the presence of a king or civil ruler. But these declarations represent the Messiah as hearing, helping, and preserving his people everywhere and in all ages. These are things which appertain only to an omnipotent nature. It is, therefore, very profitable to consider the teachings of the prophets on the worship of the Messiah. It is evident, also, that the patriarchs, prophets, and other pious persons of the Old Testament, did acknowledge the Deity of Christ by the very act of praying to him; and we

are not only instructed by these texts, as to the nature of the Son, but also consoled and incited to pray to him.

This argument, therefore, should be always in view, when aught is advanced concerning the worship of Christ, to wit: that it is an acknowledgment that he possesses a Divine nature. Prayer to an absent invisible being, attributes to him omnipotence. It assumes that he sees the hearts of all men, in all parts of the world. And with this we may also bear in mind the example set by the church, which often repeats the prayer, *Xpiste eisayōn—Christ have mercy upon us!* This prayer is a confession of Christ's Divinity.

I come now to John, who, in describing the natures of Christ, begins with the Divine. "In the beginning was the *λόγος*." So he designates the Son of God, who afterwards assumed human nature, as he subsequently says, "The word was made flesh." But speaking first of that nature which existed before the incarnation, he declares the *λόγος* to be eternal; for he says, he was anterior to the creation, and that "all things were made by him."

And this *λόγος* he calls "*God*," saying, "The Word was God." The Greek article shows that the *λόγος*, or Word, must here be taken as the subject, and the term *God* as the predicate. Nor is there anything equivocal in this Divine appellation. The design of the narration is to describe the Divine nature or essence. The name of God, therefore, is not to be understood as referring to Divine offices instituted for the government of men, as it is elsewhere said, "I said ye are gods," but as referring most directly to the eternal, omnipotent, wise and good Being, the Creator; as John afterwards also affirms that all things were made by this *λόγος*. His language therefore implies, that the *λόγος* is the eternal God and Creator.

Good and honest minds, which acquiesce in what the Gospel says, and do not call idle cavils and falsifications of the Gospel to their aid, will acknowledge this to be a firm and convincing proof upon this subject. But some astute and undevout men, such as Paul of Samosata, afterwards Photinus, and of late Servetus, have ventured wickedly to sneer at and distort the language of John, contending that *λόγος* does not mean a person, but that, as we do not say a thought or word in man is a person, but a mere quality or transient emotion, so they wish to understand the *λόγος* in John to be, not a person, but the thought or putting forth of the Father, that is, the Father himself, just as we say that the mind or

goodness of the Father is the Father himself. In short, they accommodate John's narrative to the case of a human architect. As there is in the architect the idea of his future work, which is not a person, but a thought or proposition in the architect's mind, so they say, there was in God the Creator an idea and proposition that he would manifest himself by the creation of the world, and through Christ, the excellent teacher, deliver the doctrine of salvation, and proclaim the testimonies concerning God. This thought or purpose of God, they say was the Father, and affirm that the words in Genesis, "*God said,*" refer to this thought; that is, he decreed or resolved. And the declaration of John, "All things were made by him," they take to mean that all things were constituted by the thought of this architect, or by an imperative command that the thing might be done.

Although John says, indeed, that "the word was made flesh," they so falsify as to say that eventually, according to this purpose, Christ was born of a virgin, and that John began in this way only to remind us that the Gospel is not a human device, but that it was God's eternal design to send Christ as a teacher, through whom to declare the Divine testimonies.

Inasmuch as this deceitful distortion of the truth deals with human illustrations, it pleases the irreligious and the weak with its rhetorical finish, and often leads to great misfortunes. It is necessary, therefore, to bring together the strong testimonies which prove that this *λόγος*, or the Word, must be understood as a person; for the principal matter of dispute in John's narration is, whether the *λόγος*, "Word," here denotes a person, as the whole church of God always understood and maintained? For when Paul of Samosata had disturbed the church on this subject, the venerable bishops, who had listened to the disciples of the apostles, came together at Antioch from the surrounding regions, and confuted, condemned and excommunicated him.

Bearing upon this question, Gregory of Neo-Cæsarea, an ancient bishop, whose doctrine was adjudged most pure by the church of his time, has left a written confession, which dates back long anterior to the Council of Nice. This confession appears in Eusebius, lib. 6, p. 173. "There is one God, the Father of the living Word, wise, self-existing, and the begetter of his perfect image, the Father of the only begotten Son. There is one Lord, the only Son of the only Father, the image of the Father, the effectual word, the

eternal Son from everlasting. There is one Holy Ghost, consubstantial with God, who through the Son hath appeared, the sanctifier, by whom God is known over all and in all.

I have cited this creed, not only because it contains the lucid testimony of the ancient and purer church, but also because it so clearly distinguishes the persons. It says that the Son is an image; that the Holy Ghost is the sanctifier, by whom God is known; that is, a new light kindled in our hearts, as is said in 2 Cor. 3: 18, we are changed into the same image, even as by the Spirit of the Lord.

But that the *λόγος*, or "Word," in John's narrative, means a person, is shown in the first place by the narrative itself, that John subsequently says of Christ, "He was in the world, and the world was made by him." It is evident, however, that the world was not made by Christ as a man. There must then be and abide in the Christ, born of the virgin, another nature, which was a co-creator with the Father.

This, and other similar declarations, show that there are two natures in Christ. Col. 1: 16, 17; "All things were created by him, and for him: and he is before all things, and by him all things consist." And Heb. 1: 2, 3; "God hath spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds; who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power." These passages prove conclusively that there is and abides in Christ a Divine nature, which was co-creator with the Father. The *λόγος*, therefore, does not mean a purpose or thought apart from Christ, nor yet a transient utterance, but an abiding nature, which is in Christ, a co-creator with the Father. The *λόγος* then is a person.

Thus also in John's epistle (1: 1) it is said: "That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled, of the Word of life, declare we unto you." Hereby is it testified that in the Christ himself, who was born of the virgin, there is and abides that Word which was from the beginning. The same is manifest from many testimonies yet to be adduced, which speak concerning the Divine nature in Christ, such as, "Before Abraham was, I am."

Pious minds, who know that our ideas of God must accord with what he has revealed of himself, beholding the perspicuity of these testimonies, acknowledge this saying to be wor-

thy of all acceptation, that there is a Divine nature in Christ, and that *λόγος* in this narrative denotes a person, and, with these passages in view, worship and pray to the Son of God.

Let us now inquire into the declarations of the ancient writers anterior to the Council of Nice, concerning whom Servetus has most grossly deceived his readers by mutilated quotations from Irenæus and Tertullian, just as if they denied *λόγος* to be a person or *ἰνοστάτης* before Christ was born of the virgin; but he does manifest injustice to them both. For Tertullian against Præxæs raises this express question, whether *λόγος* is a self-living nature or (as we now say) a person, and answers affirmatively that it is a person or *ἰνοστάτης*, and discusses the point in a lengthy discourse, in which are these words: "Whatsoever the substance of the (*λόγος*) utterance was, I call it a person, and claim for it the name of the Son, and know it as the Son, and defend it as the second after the Father."

Irenæus also clearly affirms, the *λόγος* to have been a person previous to the incarnation. He thus expresses himself in lib. 3, cap. 2: "I declare openly, that the *λόγος* that was in the beginning with God, through whom all things were made, who has also always been with mankind, hath God sent in these last days, according to the time appointed, to be united to his own creature, and made a man subject to death."

Origen also affirms in *περὶ ἀρχῶν*, that the *λόγος* is a person. "Let no one suppose," says he, "that when we speak of Christ as the wisdom of God, we speak of something *ἀνθορόπων* without personal Divine nature." And afterwards again:—"It is, therefore, once for all, rightly assumed, that the only begotten Son of God is his wisdom, personally subsisting." He also asserts the same thing in his treatise on the incarnation. The citations from Gregory of Neo-Cæsarea and Irenæus, however, are the clearer and stronger.

But I return to John, who, when he says "the Word was made flesh," in the first place assumes that the Father and the Word are not the same person; for the Father did not take human nature upon him. He even distinguishes himself from the Son, saying: "This is my beloved Son." In the next place, when it is said, "the Word was made flesh," a person must necessarily be understood. For, as shown above, the Divine nature who is the Creator, abides in the Christ who was born of the virgin. The *λόγος* therefore is a person. Again, if the *λόγος* were a mere thought, which is the Father himself, this thought could not be made flesh; for the Father

is not made flesh ; neither can we say of a transient utterance, that it was made flesh, for it passes away ; but the $\alpha\circ\gamma\circ\sigma$, abides in the Christ who was born of the virgin.

It follows, therefore, that in the Christ born of the virgin Mary, there are two natures, the $\alpha\circ\gamma\circ\sigma$, or Word, and humanity, so united that Christ is but one person. Here also we follow the language of the Church, which employs the term *union* to express this mystery, lest the word *commixtion*, sometimes used by the ancient writers, should lead us to think of a confusion of the two natures, and thus keep us from observing the distinction which still exists between them. Origen, though he asserts that no proper similitude can be given to illustrate this union, compares it to heated iron. As the fire penetrates the iron, intermingles with its particles, and is in it and around it ; so the $\alpha\circ\gamma\circ\sigma$, or Word, assuming humanity, appears in and through it, and humanity being permeated and enkindled by the fire of Divinity is united with the Word.

We have thus given a sufficient confutation of the false notions of the Samosatian, Photin, and Servetus, by proving that by the $\alpha\circ\gamma\circ\sigma$ or Word, we are to understand a *person*. This being done, it will now be easy to confute Arius, who admits the personality of the $\alpha\circ\gamma\circ\sigma$ in John, and then contends that this person is not of a Divine nature. John's words themselves present a complete refutation of Arius. He declares that "the Word was God." And should there be any thing equivocal in the word *God*, he further declares concerning this personal $\alpha\circ\gamma\circ\sigma$ or Word, that "all things were made by him." And if the $\alpha\circ\gamma\circ\sigma$ is an almighty person, the Creator, he must inevitably be truly God, by nature, and not merely by name.

These refutations of the Samosatian and of Arius, receive additional support from the passages which follow, and which prove that in the Christ who was born of Mary there are two natures, the Divine, which is the Creator of all things, and the human.

John 20 : 28 ; Thomas solemnly calls Christ God. "My Lord and my God." This he said in the common Hebrew phraseology expressing the proper title of God, by which the true worship is distinguished from that of the heathen, as in Ps. 20 : 7, "We will remember the name of the Lord our God." New and amazing light suddenly dawned upon the mind of Thomas, and he ascribed to Christ the name of the true God, and acknowledged that in him is a Divine as well as a human nature.

Rom. 9: 5; "Of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever." And lest some should cavil, and say that the name of God is here metaphorically applied, we can add proof-texts which ascribe things to Christ which belong only to Deity, such as the work of creation, the resuscitation of the dead, the sanctification of the soul, and the bestowment of eternal life. John 5: 17, 21; "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work; for whatsoever things he doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise." "For as the Father raiseth up the dead and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom he will." In these declarations Christ clearly affirms that he, together with the Father, created and upholds what is made, preserves the Church and raises the dead, which things beyond question belong alone to an almighty nature. John 10: 28; "I give unto them eternal life, and none shall pluck them out of my hand." John 14: 13; "Whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, that I will do." Here he proclaims that he hears and grants our prayers, which things belong only to an infinite and Divine nature. John 15: 5; "Without me ye can do nothing." This testifies that Christ is with, protects, helps and directs those who call upon him; which can be said only of God. Matt. 18: 20; "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I, in the midst of them." To be present everywhere, to favor and help everywhere, are things which cannot be predicated of any one but Deity. John 20: 22; Christ here imparts the Holy Ghost, which is the exclusive prerogative of God. John 10: 17, 18; "I lay down my life, that I may take it again." John 6: 40, 62; "I will raise him up at the last day": "Ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before." John 8: 55; "Before Abraham was, I am." Here his existence before he assumed human nature is positively asserted. John 17: 5; "Glory thou me, O Father, with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was." Col. 1: 16; "All things were made by him, and for him, and by him all things consist;" consequently, the same Divine nature is in Christ, which is the Creator of all things. Hence it is said in Col. 2: 9, "In him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily;" as much as to say, in other men God dwells by his Holy Spirit, kindling new life, light, and affections, but he dwells in Christ, not only by his Holy Spirit, but in a way in which the Deity is incorporated with humanity in personal union; for the ancient Greeks used the word *soumata*, *bodies*,

in the same sense that we now use the word *person*. Heb. 1: 2; "Whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds, who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power," &c. Acts 7: 59;—"Lord Jesus receive my spirit!" This petition represents Christ as watching over the souls of the dying, and uniting them again with the bodies. 1 Thes. 3: 11; "Now God himself, and our Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ, direct our way." 2 Thess. 2: 16; "Our Lord Jesus Christ and God even our Father establish you."

Proof-texts from the Old Testament.—Jer. 33: 16; "And this is the name, wherewith they shall call him, *The Lord our Justificator*." Here he ascribes to Christ a name peculiar to God, and asserts that he is the one who justifies us. He therefore ascribes to him the glory which is due only to God. None but God is able to justify, to take away sin and Divine wrath, to restore righteousness and life everlasting. And though the Jews craftily resist and hoot at this testimony, it is not hard to confute them; for the prophet plainly states that this same personage should be called Messiah, that is, be invoked in the belief that he is God our justifier. To this very same person, the Messiah, belongs the title in Is. 7: 14; "Call his name Immanuel," which means *God with us*. But the following is still stronger: Is. 9: 6; "And his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the mighty God, the Father of eternal life." If Christ is the author and giver of eternal life, as he says, "I give unto them eternal life," he must needs be, by nature, God. Mic. 5: 2. "Whose goings forth have been from old, from everlasting." This passage, though brief, yet testifies that the Messiah was before the creation of the world, and must therefore be eternal, and God. Hence it is that the patriarchs knew him from the beginning, and felt assured that he was with his Church in all ages, as the words of Jacob prove; as also the case of Daniel, with whom he conversed in his trials, whom he comforted in his terrors, and filled with new light and life shows; and as Paul in 1 Cor. 10: 4, declares of Israel in the desert, "they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them, and that Rock was Christ." Ps. 45: 11; "So shall the king greatly desire thy beauty, for he is thy Lord;" also attributes to the Messiah the proper name of God, in connection with a precious promise. In this life the Church has much deformity, wretchedness, and weakness, yet the king Messiah

loves her, and declares her beautiful. With these blessed assurances then, let those pious souls console themselves amid their struggles with infirmity.

Ps. 72 declares that the Messiah is everlasting, and that he is to be worshipped. "His name shall endure for ever;" "all nations shall be blessed in him;" "they shall fear thee as long as the sun and moon endure." Adoration belongs only to Deity, yet here is a perpetual adoration directed to the invisible Messiah, and therefore not only such outward gestures of reverence as are customary in the presence of kings. The same texts also ascribe to him eternity. "His name was before the sun;"* that is, Christ existed before the creation of the sun. The Hebrew Psalter here uses a remarkable word, which doubtless signifies that the Son Messiah was born before the creation of the solar orb.

Ps. 110 : 1; "The Lord said unto my Lord." From this Christ proves that he is not only the Son, but also the Lord of David. In earthly kingdoms and successions the lordship of the successor does not extend back over those who have preceded him. The king's son is not the Lord of his father and ancestors. Augustus was not the Lord of Julius Cæsar. The Messiah's kingdom is therefore something different from the short-lived governments of this world. It is an eternal life and righteousness; and accordingly there must be in Christ a Divine nature giving eternal life, as also the remaining portions of this Psalm, which are to be embraced in this argument, teach us (v. 4). "Thou art a priest for ever." Here an everlasting priesthood is ascribed to him, in the exercise of which he brings us to the Father, and imparts eternal life. "Sit thou on my right hand;" that is, to rule in equal power with the eternal Father. And as the power thus ascribed to him is infinite, it inevitably follows that his nature is Divine.

Ps. 2 : 7. "This day have I begotten thee." This is said of none but Christ. John speaks of him in like manner as "the only begotten Son of God." That is to say, he is the Son of God, not by adoption, but by nature. But he only is the Son by nature, in whom the substance of the Father is embodied by generation.

As to the objection, that the Divine nature neither suffers nor dies, whereas Christ died, the general, true and necessary

* A peculiar turn of the Hebrew original, which does not appear in the English version—Ps. 72 : 17.—Tr.

answer is this : That as there are two natures in Christ, the peculiarities proper to the one, do not interfere with the other. The peculiarities of humanity are, that it is liable to wounds, suffering and death. Accordingly, Peter says that Christ suffered "according to the flesh;" and Irenaeus ably and piously remarks, (pp. 185) that "Christ was crucified and died, and that the ὁντος, or Word, acquiesced in the crucifixion and death;" that is, it was not the Divine nature that suffered and died, but the Divine nature was obedient to the Father, was passive, submitted to the Father's everlasting wrath against the sins of men, made no use of its power, did not exert its strength. By attentively considering what is contained in these words of Irenaeus, you will find an affecting demonstration of the distinction of natures in Christ, an illustration of the Divine wrath against sin which overwhelmed him, and a picture of the amazing humility of the Son, in becoming thus passive and obedient to the Father, not using his power. This corresponds with Philippians 2: 6. "Who, being in the form of God," that is, in wisdom and power equal to the Father, "thought it not robbery to be equal with God;" that is, inasmuch as he was sent for the purpose of rendering obedience to God in his sufferings, he did not act contrary to his mission, or make use of his power against what he came to do, but "made himself of no reputation," that is, he did not exert his power, but humbled himself, "and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men;" he put on mortal humanity; "being found in fashion as a man," a man in his affections, fears, sorrows and sufferings. Let the difference of natures in Christ then be held fast as settled, and be it known at the same time, that by reason of the personal union, the following propositions are true : God suffered, was crucified, died. Do not imagine that humanity alone, and not the whole Son of God, is the Redeemer. For, although the Divinity was not wounded, and did not die, yet, be assured, that the very Son himself, co-eternal with the Father, is thy Saviour. Therefore, rules are given in this doctrine concerning the *communicatio idiomatum*, that is, the doctrine concerning the predication of properties, which are affirmed of both natures in common, but in the concrete, that is, the properties are understood to be attributed to the person.

It is worthy of the attention of the pious, for the sake of uniformity, to be careful to employ the same terms used by the Church ; for it is not without solid reasons that the an-

cient Church approved some terms, and rejected others. Avoiding all subtleties, let us then retain the forms of expression which have come down to us upon valuable and true authority. The proposition before us is not, that the Divine nature is human. A true statement of it would run in this form: God is man, the Word is man, Christ is man, Christ is God, God is born into the world of the virgin and suffered: inasmuch as that person in which the human and Divine natures are personally united, was born and crucified. This way of presenting the matter in the concrete, is called the *communicatio idiomatum*, that is, the predication by which the peculiar properties of both natures are of right attributed to one person, so that the *Son of God* is the Redeemer, and not merely the human nature. The following are also received and true propositions: The Word was made flesh; the Word was made man; God began to be man. On the other hand, the following propositions—The Word is a creature—Christ is a creature—Christ had a beginning—Christ is created—have been rejected. For what is ambiguous and ensnaring has been carefully avoided. For when the Arians used this language, they spoke not of the humanity which Christ assumed, but contended that the nature which Christ had anterior to his incarnation, was created out of nothing, that he is not the image of the eternal Father, begotten from his substance, *quoniam* and co-eternal with him.

The statement that the Word is man, was received, because it is understood that the Word assumed humanity. The statement that the Word is a creature, was rejected, because the assumption of the other nature is not understood, whilst the affirmation signifies that the *αὐτός* is a creature, which is false. I refer to these things, that the student may be admonished of the importance of pious care to imitate and conform to the language of the orthodox Church.

It is also necessary to note, that some passages of the Scripture speak of Christ's essence and nature, whilst others speak only of his offices and condition. The Arians quoted the words, (John 14: 28) "The Father is greater than I;" which evidently refer to the distinction that exists between him who sends, and him who is sent, and not to essence. For the Jews had accused Christ that he taught contrary to the authority of God, and it was necessary for him to allege the authority of the Father by whom he asserted that he was sent, and from whom he derived both the doctrine which he taught, and the commission to teach it; and when he says

the Father is greater than he, it is only in so far as the Father exercises the office of sending the Son, of giving the doctrine taught, and of approving and defending his truth and Church.

So, in another place, (John 17 : 5) it is said, "Father, glorify thou me." The Arians quoted this passage just as they did the one noticed above; but it only makes discrimination of offices, and says nothing concerning nature; as though he had said, being sent, I am now delivered over to the cross, and I fulfil my mission; but when that is accomplished, restore to me the glory which I had with thee before the foundation of the world. This passage in John 1 : 1, however, says of the essence: "*The word was God.*"

It is often necessary here to make this explanation, which the reader of the Scriptures certainly will not overlook. Other passages speak of Christ as an exalted sovereign, as (John 5 : 19) where it is said, the things that the Father doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise. Other passages speak of his humiliation and sufferings; as (Matt. 27 : 46,) where it is said, "My God, why hast thou forsaken me?" This is not said concerning essence, but describes simply his obedience at that moment in which the Divine wrath against the sins of men was poured out upon the Son. It must therefore be held as settled, that the Son of God assumed human nature, complete and uncorrupted, having all the proper and ordinary powers and appetites of nature; virtuous, though liable to suffering, sinless and mortal. He assumed these infirmities voluntarily for our sakes, that he might be made a sacrifice for sin. So it is said in Heb. 4 : 15: "We have not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, but was tempted in all points like as we are, yet without sin."

Although Christ, therefore, was happy in the Father's presence, nevertheless his human nature had all the appropriate appetites and affections of man, but controlled and regulated. We also see this frequently exhibited. He hungered, he thirsted, he rejoiced, he was angry, he grieved, he wept, he was oppressed with great sadness, as he himself says, (Matt. 26 : 38) "My soul is sorrowful even unto death." Soul-sadness we all know to be exceedingly bitter; and so great was this anguish in Christ, that it pressed the blood through his pores, and made his sweat as thick and clotted blood; for this is the meaning of *θρόπεδον*. No mere man

could have borne such dissolving agony. These affections in Christ were not feigned, but real, and most deeply felt.

Let us not suppose that Christ was a stone or a Stoic, but truly was glad, experienced the pangs of grief, and suffered this intense sorrow in the agony to which many causes contributed, dreading not only the wounding of his body, but feeling a heavier burden, even God's wrath against the sins of the human race, which he knew was to be poured out upon him, the same as if he himself had been guilty of all the horrible crimes of all men. It grieved him too, to know that so large a portion of mankind would perish in spite of his great deeds of love. We are not able to comprehend, much less bear these immense sufferings. But it is still necessary for the people of God to consider somewhat concerning these things, that they may learn from the weight of the cross, what is the greatness of God's wrath against sin.

Whilst, therefore, peculiar wrath was poured upon the Son, his sufferings must needs have been very great, in that he was made to feel God's anger with the human race, and had to struggle with temptations to despondency. Hence was the angel sent to comfort him. These things are to be considered, in order that we may form a just estimate of the heinousness of sin, and be moved to thankfulness to Christ for having borne the penalty for us, and, at the same time, became our mediator, and by such considerations to call forth faith, prayer and godly fear.

As to the question whether Christ's fearful apprehension of death was sinful, inasmuch as his inferior nature did not concur with the higher; I answer first, that wounds of the flesh naturally produce pains, even where there is no sin; and that there are some natural sorrows of heart and soul which in Christ were without sin; he grieved, but not as we, inordinately.

Then again, in addition to these pains which belong to our nature, Christ had a deep consciousness of the wrath of God against human guilt. He knew, and it grieved him, that God was truly and terrifically offended on account of the sins of men, and he had to wrestle with temptations to despondency. Accordingly, there was some shrinking in this struggle, for nature, when wearied beyond its strength, universally will groan, yet this shrinking or groaning on the part of the Saviour, was different from what we see in other men. Christ bore his terrors without resentment towards the Father, and acknowledged acquiescence in the Father's will.

His trembling, therefore, was not reprehensible nor wicked. In other men, such dread is accompanied with murmuring against God's allotments, and in those who have not fled for refuge to the victory of Christ, horrid blasphemies arise. Further I will not argue the point; for the pious are, at any rate, led by their own afflictions to the consideration of these things. Nevertheless, it is useful that we have them brought to our remembrance, and this is apparent from various references to similar conflicts in the Psalms and prophets.

As to what is said concerning the contradiction that a happy one cannot be in great joy and great consternation at the same time, it may be responded, that there was a certain time of the passion, in which his glory and bliss were not such as at other times. For there was a time appointed for this conflict, in which Christ was really made a sacrifice, the Word quietly acquiescing, as Irenaeus says. With this distinction of times let us be content. Others may ask for other answers, judgment concerning which I leave to the reader.

CONCERNING THE HOLY SPIRIT.

Spirit is a name which, in general, conveys the idea of motion, life, or motive power, and is so variously used in the sacred writings, that we must be careful not to confound together all the passages in which it occurs. It sometimes signifies breath, sometimes a man's life, sometimes the created emotions or passions of men, whether good or bad. Here it means a spiritual essence, that is, a living, intelligent, incorporeal and operative Being. "God is a spirit." In this passage it is a name common to the three persons in the Godhead. Hence, in collecting the texts that bear upon the subject, discrimination must be exercised, and only those selected which properly relate to the Holy Ghost, who, according to the declaration of the Gospel, is given by Christ to quicken and sanctify our hearts, and whom the Church confesses to be a Divine person, life-giving and sanctifying.

It devolves upon us, then, to establish the fact, that the Holy Ghost is a person; for many impious and audacious men, in the dissensions through which the Church has passed, have contended that the Holy Ghost is not a person, but signifies only the active influences created in man, or else the operating power of the Father himself without another personality.

But against this wicked sophism, the true Church adduces three testimonies, drawn from the holy Scriptures. The first and clearest of which is, the revelation given of the Godhead in the facts attending the Saviour's baptism, where we distinctly discern three persons. The Father says, (Matt. 3: 17) "This is mybeloved Son." There is, then, one person of the Father, and another person of the Son ; whilst the Holy Ghost descends in the form of a dove. Now, if the Holy Ghost were but an influence created in the mind, he could not appear in a separate corporeal form ; or if it were the Father himself, he could not make a visible distinction between it and himself, it is said, however, "I saw the Holy Spirit descending upon him."

So again on the day of Pentecost, the Holy Ghost appeared in a peculiar, corporeal form. These manifestations cannot deceive, nay, they are precious Divine favors, by which God revealed himself to the Church, and testified that the Holy Ghost is a person.

To these testimonies is to be added the formula of baptism, "I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;" that is, I certify that thou art accepted of God, whom I invoke over thee as the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. But as this invocation is directed as well to the Holy Ghost as to the Father and the Son, so he must needs be a person, and not a motion or influence created in man. For by no means does Christ teach us to address our worship to a created motion or influence created in man. As then this baptismal invocation is directed to the Holy Ghost equally with the Father and the Son, this passage teaches, not only that the Holy Ghost is a person, but that he is also omnipresent, able to hear prayer, and to impart saving grace ; for all this is implied in the service which ascribes equal honor to the Father, Son and Holy Ghost. The Holy Ghost, therefore, is a third person, and distinguishable from the Father and the Son, as said above, because he proceeds from the Father and the Son, and is sent into the hearts that are regenerated by the word of the Gospel, that by new light they may know and call upon God, and have eternal life planted in them, whilst by faith they obtain comfort.

John 14: 16.—"I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter." When he says "another," he distinguishes this Comforter from the Father and the Son. The Spirit therefore does not denote a motion or operation of the

Father himself, for that would not be "another;" neither does it signify a created motion, for it would not be sent by the Son if the Father were the mover, or if the motion were merely a creature of the Father. On the other hand, Christ says, John 15 : 26, "When the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father." From himself he says he will send the Holy Spirit. It appears then that neither is the Father the mover, nor is it a mere motion created by the Father.

There are also these peculiar attributes of a person:— "Another Comforter, who shall teach you, and what he hear- eth, that shall he speak." If the Spirit meant a created motion or influence, it would be a *doctrine*, not another *doctor* from the Father and the Son, hearing and talking.

So also Paul, 1 Cor. 12 : 11, clearly distinguishes the Holy Spirit from created gifts, the author from the effects, saying, "All these things worketh that one and the self-same Spirit."

So also in Rom. 8 : 16, he says, "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirits." He here draws a distinction between the Holy Ghost which moves and consoles, and the consolation by which the heart is comforted and quickened.

Thus again, in 2 Cor. 3 : 18, he says, "We are changed into the same image, even as by the Spirit of the Lord." There too the agent is distinguished from the light produced in us, as where he says "with open face beholding," that is, with clear and strong knowledge, to wit, from strong faith and prayer.

In the preceding verse of the same chapter, he says expressly, that "the Lord is that Spirit;" that is, the Spirit is God; for when he says the Lord is the Spirit, the article gives to the noun, Spirit, the place and meaning of the subject. So Basil also quotes these words.

As to what the Holy Ghost was before the Son of God became incarnate, Peter clearly declares, where he says of the prophets, that the Spirit of Christ in them foretold that Christ should suffer. Here he who was in the prophets, is expressly called the Spirit of Christ. Accordingly, it is by the same Holy Ghost that the patriarchs, and apostles, and all the saints since them, that is, all the elect of all ages, were sanctified.

The words of Isaiah, 59 : 21, teach this still more plainly. "This is my covenant with them, saith the Lord; My Spirit that is upon thee, and my words which I have put in thy

mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, saith the Lord, from henceforth, even for ever." He here says that the same Spirit is upon Isaiah, and upon the whole Church in all ages. It was not only since the resurrection of Christ then, that the Holy Ghost was poured out into the hearts of the saints, but by that same Spirit have all the elect of all time been sanctified. And these words of Isaiah are freighted with this precious doctrine and consolation, that the Church of God will continue for ever, and remain as long and as wide-spread as the message of the Gospel sounds, and the Word of God retains the efficacy which the Holy Spirit gives it. We also read in Zech. 7 : 12, "The words which the Lord of hosts has sent in his Spirit by the former prophets." These words also affirm that the prophets were directed by the Holy Ghost, and that the Divine Word is no empty sound, but accompanied with the Holy Ghost, and thereby made effective to move and enlighten the minds of men. These things ought to be carefully digested by the pious, and firmly embraced, that they may know that God worketh effectually by his word in the hearts of them that believe, and kindles in them eternal life, as it is said in Gal. 3 : 14, "We receive the promise of the Spirit through faith." But more of this hereafter.

So too, in Isaiah 63 : 11, it is affirmed that the Holy Spirit was the guide and director of Moses and the people in the desert; from which we learn that the Holy Ghost is always with the Church, just as Christ declares, John 14 : 16, "He shall give you another comforter, that he may abide with you for ever." The words of Isaiah are these: "Where is he that brought them up out of the sea with the shepherd of his flock? where is he that put his Holy Spirit within him? that led them by the right hand of Moses, with his glorious arm, dividing the water before them?" He also adds subsequently, that "the Spirit of the Lord did lead them."

These words prove that the doctrine, concerning the Holy Ghost, existed in the Church of the patriarchs and prophets, and that the ancients accordingly understood the passage in Genesis, "The Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters," as referring to the Holy Ghost, a person of the God-head. To this Basil also testifies: "It is correctly stated by those who have lived before us, that this passage speaks of the Holy Spirit of God; for it is a rule in Scripture interpretation, that when the Spirit of God is spoken of, we must understand by it the Holy Ghost, the third person of the

Holy Trinity. And by taking these words of Moses in this sense, you will find them much more fruitful in meaning. How then did the Spirit move upon the waters? In the language of a certain Syrian, "the word here used signifies to cherish with vital warmth, just as a bird sits upon her eggs to hatch them." So much for Basil. But the testimonies from the New Testament are much more pointed and decisive. In whatever way we interpret the quotation from Genesis, it certainly is true that the Holy Spirit moves the Church, by overshadowing and instructing, and enlightening her, and by kindling within her the light of prayer and supplication. This must be most firmly believed, as it is written, Acts 2: 33, 34, that Christ is at the right hand of the Father, that he may pour out his Holy Spirit. The same is also taught where it is said, "He ascended up, and gave gifts unto men." Let us accordingly pray for these gifts in faith, that the Son of God may guide and govern us by his Holy Spirit.

Having now reviewed the testimonies which prove that the Holy Ghost is a person, I will yet add to them, 1 John 5: 7, "For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the *λόγος*, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one." In that he says they "bear record," he brings forward the revelation of God, that we may acknowledge God just as he has revealed himself. God has borne record concerning himself, as to who and what he is, the true God, maker of all things, the preserver and helper. He also testifies concerning his truth and his will towards us, and declares that there are three in heaven who have borne record.

Let us therefore hold fast these testimonies of difference of persons in the Godhead. The Father revealed himself when he said, "This is my beloved Son;" also John 12: 18, "I have glorified thee, and will glorify thee." The Son bears record concerning the Father, himself, and the Holy Ghost, in his teachings, which he attested by miracles and his own resurrection. The Holy Ghost is discriminated in that he was poured out upon Christ and the apostles in his own peculiar form, and was witnessed to afterwards in prayer, confession, miracles, constancy under sufferings, and other particulars. John's mention of the record above was not, therefore, a vain assertion, but in strict accordance with the facts, that we might be admonished to acknowledge God as he has revealed himself, and be established and strengthened by the presentation of these same testimonies.

But, although the words of the New Testament are so much more perspicuous, the witness of the prophets agrees with them. A Divine person is signified speaking to Joel (2 : 28), where God says, "I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh." For in that he saith, "of my *Spirit*," it is evident that not a created influence is sent, but something of Divine essence. That which is something Divine, and yet not the Father, must of necessity be a distinct person. But how great is the mercy, how vast is the love towards mankind, that God has poured out this fire of love co-essential with himself!

Basil has also collected the testimonies of many whose authority was very great in the Church before his time, to which it is important to advert. For the pious are greatly strengthened when they hear that a doctrine has come down to them by the clear testimonies of the true and purer Church, so that it may be properly said concerning the hearing of the Church : "If ye had not ploughed with my heifer, ye had not found it."—*Judg. 14: 18.*

Accordingly he quotes, among others, these words of Eusebius of Palestine : "Calling upon the holy God, the Creator of light, through Jesus our Saviour, with the Holy Ghost." These words show that the ancients distinctly embraced three persons in worship, and so spoke of the Son that their minds were, at the same time, directed to his intercession and promises as the Mediator. In this connection belongs also the testimony which we recite in the Creed : "I believe in the Holy Ghost." For as it is previously said, "I believe in God the Father, and in Jesus Christ, (by which form of expression we address the persons and ask good from them, and repose faith upon the help of the Father and the Son;) so when it is here said, "I believe in the Holy Ghost, a person is understood, and we pray that this *παρακλητός* may be sent into our hearts, govern and lead us in the many dangers of life, just as he led Moses through the red sea, as Isaiah says.

Thus far I have reviewed the true and saving doctrine concerning the persons, and inasmuch as I have said that the testimonies of the true Church are not to be neglected, let the pious also read history, and see in what Synods this doctrine was faithfully set forth and defended. That of Antioch refuted Paul of Samosata. That of Nice composed the Nicene Creed, and particularly set forth the doctrine of the two natures in Christ. That of Constantinople defended this article, that the Holy Spirit is a person proceeding from the

Father and the Son. That of Ephesus condemned Nestorius who had imagined that there was but one, and not two natures in Christ, and that the $\alpha\gamma\tau\omega$, only assisted Christ, as a friend gives aid to a friend. That of Chalcedon condemned Eutyches, who had confounded the natures, and imagined the human converted into the Divine, as when water is made wine, and that the two natures were one. These are the principal Synods whose decisions we should remember and embrace.

Let us now also consider the contrary and false teachings concerning the Divine essence, which have sprung up in the course of history. Marcion and the Manicheans imagined two Gods, equally eternal, and in conflict with each other, the good and the bad; and the good they called light, and the evil darkness; and attributed to the good the creation of all good creatures, and to the bad the production of all evil things.

These wild fancies may easily be refuted. For one is the Creator of all things, and the same is good, as was said above, in the definition of God, and in Isaiah (45: 6) it is said, "I am the Lord, and there is none else. I form the light and create the darkness. I make peace and create evil," that is, afflictions and things hurtful.

Other monstrous fancies which we are to avoid, are those of the Valentinians, who imagined innumerable Gods, either accumulating names allegorically, (as Hesiod has done where he groups together Chaos, Night, Erebus, Saturn, Jupiter and so on) or else in fact believing that there are countless numbers of eternal deities, because it seemed incredible to them that one should have existed in eternal solitude. The Devil always has been busy, from the foundation of the world, and will also hereafter employ himself, in disseminating monstrous errors, in order to bring the true God into contempt, and to establish himself by taking advantage of human weakness. To preserve against these miserable fantasies, God has, by the patriarchs and prophets, by Christ and his apostles, given unto us the sure doctrine, that the Church might be led by this light, and refuse to admit any other teachings. As the embryo in the maternal womb lies surrounded by what nourishes it, so should we regard that we are surrounded by the word of God until we are born into eternal life, and shall see God face to face. Meanwhile, let us give thanks to God that

he has revealed himself to us, and devoutly acquiesce in what he has made known.

We know that there are no more than three Divine persons. There is one co-eternal Father of our Lord Jesus Christ; one Son, the image of the eternal Father, Jesus Christ; one Holy Spirit; and that these three persons are *διορθωτικοί*, of the same substantial nature, and have together made all things, and let us learn the distinctions between them, as we have recited above, and familiarize ourselves with the benefactions peculiar to each of these several persons; for as God has revealed himself in this form, it is his desire that we should thus understand and observe these distinctions. The Father is the source of all good; but the Son is properly the Mediator and Reconciler, who, when he had assumed human nature, became a sacrifice for us. The Holy Ghost is sent into the hearts of believers, to kindle in them new light, righteousness and eternal life. Zechariah (12: 10) calls him "the Spirit of grace and supplication;" that is, the Spirit witnessing in us that we are received into favor, and moving the heart to believe and rely upon it, also inciting to call upon God, inasmuch as we believe that our prayers are now heard and accepted.

Every day should this doctrine of three persons be brought forward in worship, in which this is certainly above all, most fervently to be asked, that God may govern our hearts that we may have right views concerning himself, and pray to him truly, and not wander from him in our thoughts, as the heathen, the modern Jews, the Mohammedans, the heretics, Marcion, the Manicheans, Valentinians, the adherents of him of Samosata, of Arius, and all other fanatics. Hence, let not that good and true form [of prayer] be abandoned, the recital of which may call up the true doctrine.

Omnipotent, eternal, and living God! the eternal Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hast manifested thyself in thine infinite goodness, and declared concerning thy Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, "Hear ye him!" Thou Maker, Preserver, and Helper of all things, who, together with thy co-eternal Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, who reigns with thee, and who appeared at Jerusalem, and the Holy Ghost, shed forth by thee upon the apostles, art wise, good, merciful, just and mighty! Thou who hast said, "As I live I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but that the wicked turn from his evil way and live;" and hast said, "Call upon me in time of trouble, and I will deliver thee!" Have mercy

upon me, for the sake of Jesus Christ, thy Son, our Lord, whom thou hast ordained to be our propitiation, mediator and intercessor; and sanctify, govern, help, and illuminate my heart and mind by thy Holy Spirit, that I may know and worship thee aright, believe truly on thee, and accept and obey thy grace. Govern and preserve thy Church as thou hast promised saying: This is my covenant with thee, my Spirit which is in thee, and my words which are in thy mouth shall not depart out of the mouth of thy seed for ever." Let thy Gospel always shine among us, and govern and establish our hearts by thy Holy Spirit, lest we fall into licentiousness or wicked errors. Direct all the undertakings of thy people, and protect all those in authority who prove themselves thy people's friends!"

By daily using a prayer like this, we will be continually reminded of the Divine nature, the manner in which he has revealed himself, the blessings he bestows, and the promises he makes. And thus ordering our meditations, we will acquire a right knowledge of the persons, our faith will be increased, and our worship will be distinguished from that of the Heathen, Turks and Jews, as it ought to be. For no worship is acceptable to God, unless it be rendered with the mind and heart, and with faith in Christ the Mediator, as the Scripture says (John 16: 23), "Whosoever ye ask the Father in my name, (that is, by mentioning my name, and looking to me as your Intercessor) he will give it you." Again, (John 14: 6) "No man cometh to the Father except through me," but will find it no vain thing to draw near to God in the way which the Gospel inculcates.

Let us then turn our thoughts and eyes to the clear testimonies of revelation, to Christ's baptism, his resurrection from the dead, his intercourse with many after his resurrection, and the outpouring of the Holy Ghost. These testimonies were given, and these visible displays made, to teach and establish the Church; and inasmuch as they have been given, God intends that we should observe and consider them. It was not only for John the Baptist that the Godhead revealed itself at the baptism; but God designed thereby to instruct and fortify the whole Church of that and all subsequent ages. Nay, the amazing spectacle of the coming forth of God from his mysterious secrecy, to make himself known to his people, is a matter of interest and instruction, even to the angels. And by meditating upon these things, our hearts will be enlightened the more firmly to believe that God is with us, and

accepts our prayers, and will help us, as he has promised; for it is necessary that this faith should accompany our prayers.

We may also profitably use this form, directed to the Mediator, which also embraces the three persons:

"Jesus Christ, Son of the living God, crucified and raised again for us, who reignest at the right hand of the Father in order to give gifts unto men, and art ordained to be an advocate for us, have mercy on me, and intercede for me before thy eternal Father, and sanctify me by thy Holy Spirit, as thou hast promised saying: "I will not leave you comfortless," &c.

The following form may also be advantageously employed: "Holy Spirit who wast poured out upon the apostles, whom the Son of God, our Redeemer, promised to us, to kindle in us the true knowledge and worship of God, as it is written: I will pour out upon you the Spirit of grace and supplication; create in our hearts a true fear of God, and true faith and knowledge of the mercy which the eternal Father of our Lord Jesus Christ hath for his Son's sake promised unto us, be our comforter in all trials and dangers, and enlighten our minds, that by true obedience we may glorify the Father of the Lord Jesus Christ, and his Son, our Redeemer, and thyself, world without end!"

If we observe this mode of distinguishing in prayer between the persons, and the benefactions of each, our minds will grow in knowledge and piety. Concerning what remains, let the student know this, that the appellations of natural and moral excellence are common to all the persons, such as the attributes of wisdom, of goodness, of justice, mercy, power, holiness. Nor are these attributes things distinct from the essence. For the power of the Father, is the Father; so the justice of the Father is the Father; so the righteousness of the Son is the Son. It is important to note how these titles are employed in the prophetic Scriptures, and care should be given to use proper and exact language.

ARTICLE II.

THE MINISTERIAL OFFICE.

By Rev. P. Eirich, Lithopolis, Ohio.

The above subject has, of late, been pretty thoroughly canvassed and discussed. After our Church in Germany had recovered itself somewhat from the almost universal swoon of Rationalism, Pantheism, a so-styled higher criticism, &c., and had made itself conscious, once more, to some extent, of her ancient landmarks and priceless heirloom, the inquiry arose concerning the true import and contents of her invaluable possessions. The turbulence of the time, the great wrath of Satan, as manifested in the wild, reckless progressivism, and the licentious fury and Vandalism of the masses, drove the chosen servants of the Church, quite naturally, to the investigation of the nature of that office in virtue of which they stood forth as valiant soldiers of the Gospel and the cross. "By what authority do I speak to these rebellious and gainsaying multitudes?" was the inquiry forced upon the earnest ambassador of Christ, who desired to build gold, silver and precious stones upon the eternally laid foundations of God's unparalleled love. "Have I a right to call them to repentance? Has the Lord called me to be a voice crying in this wilderness of human unbelief and apostacy? Is there necessity laid upon me, so that *woe is me* if I preach not the Gospel of Christ? Shall I continue, whether men will hear or forbear? May I trust that my labor shall not be in vain in the Lord? And whence have I the authority to reprove, rebuke and exhort with all long-suffering and doctrine? Who has invested me with the office in consequence of which I speak?"

"Moreover, how shall the evil be remedied? By what power shall the dead bones be made to live and jostle; to stand on their feet and walk? What will stay and repel the on-rolling tide of destruction and spiritual death? How may the degenerate, fallen Church be raised, and God's work revived?"

In answering these interrogatories, in a day when desolation, and the slain of the daughter of Zion surrounded the watchman on every side, and when the walls of Jerusalem

were levelled to the ground, it was natural enough for the human mind, in its weakness, its proneness to error and its proclivity to look to things seen, rather than walk by faith, to search for props for authority, which, however sincerely adopted, grievously desert man in the hour of need. "The office of the keys, which is the very marrow and quintessence of the Gospel—can it have been committed to the whole Chnrch?" "And has the office of preaching been conferred on me, by that Church whose beauty is marred by so many tares, and which has within its bosom so many unbelievers and mockers?"—asked the ambassador of Christ. "How can this be?" A different authority is here needed, it was supposed. A hierarchy of some sort, with a wheel within a wheel, perfectly adjusted and fitted together, it seemed, would do the work. A kind of ministerial succession which obtains the office by ordination, and constitutes an order, or caste, over against and above the laity, is the desideratum. Make the ministerial office a means of grace, in some way, and charge it with authority to require obedience in all matters, not contrary to God's Word, and astounding results must follow. Thus a theory was soon projected and completed which, it was thought, was at least taught in the sacred Scriptures. Efforts were then made to reconcile it with our Confessions. Some, by hard labor and unmerciful tortures, supposed they had succeeded. But such men as Rudelbach (and of late Löhe) gave it up as a hopeless task; acknowledged the fact of the discrepancy, and consoled themselves with the allegation, either that vestiges of their theory are at least discoverable in the private writings of some of our older theologians, or else, that the Symbols themselves are susceptible of, and need development and correction in this respect. This party is generally termed the High-Church party.

But there was another class of men, who said with Luther: "The Word, the Word, the Word must do it! We will write it, we will speak it, and we will preach it." This is the means which God has given to his Church for her revivification and perpetuity! The Word has this power in itself, independent of any castely authority; for it is God's inspired Word—the *power of God* unto salvation of all that believe. The Church is Christ's chosen Bride, unto whom he has committed the Word, the Sacraments, apostles, prophets, teachers and pastors. The ministry are no caste, but simply

christians endowed with an office by Christ, through the call of the Church, &c.

Whilst these things were proceeding among our transatlantic brethren, the same inquiries were made, and the same controversies carried on in our own midst, by the Synods of Buffalo and Missouri. They exhibited a warmth and zeal, which clearly indicated the momentousness of the points at issue, and the great truths that were at stake. Other Synods long abstained from entering the field. Of late, however, the discussion leaped over its former boundaries in the far Northwest, among our Scandinavian Churches, who are taking a lively interest in its claims. And even the Synod of Ohio, which is generally so imperturbable, and so little prone to catch fire, has been drawn into its circle. It was felt here, too, that the great question of the nature of the Church, and of the office of the ministry can be ignored no longer. It solicits, it peremptorily calls for a positive and explicit answer. The unity of the faith which the apostle bids brethren to maintain, so that they be perfectly joined together in the same mind, and in the same judgment, and all speak the same things (1 Cor. 1 : 10), also requires an understanding on this point. Hence two combatants have entered the arena in the "Lutheran Standard;" from which it has been taken up to Synodical discussion. And here the consequences are most alarming. Great and far-reaching differences have already come to light—one party advocating, with some variation, what is generally called the Missouri view—and the other, the Grabau theory to its furthest limits. Neither is there any disposition to yield on either side. Both parties are evidently strengthening their stakes and fortifying their position. And with the Symbolic ground which the Synod of Ohio professes to occupy, the one party, or the other, will be eventually compelled to quit the field. For it would surely be the acme of inconsistency, to cling to the teachings of the Symbols in other respects, and unchurch men who reject these, and yet allow wide departures on this momentous question, within its own bounds. How can the Ohio Synod refuse fellowship to those who do not adopt the Symbolical doctrine of the Lord's Supper, of Holy Baptism, of Original Sin, &c., and still keep in Synodical fellowship her own members who implicitly and essentially reject the doctrine of our Confessions concerning the Gospel ministry, which, in the time of the Reformation, was second only to the great truth of justification by faith alone?

There is ground, then, for deeply deplored the circumstance that in these days of sectarianism, of the revival and reinvigoration of the Papacy, and the prowling about of Satan in myriad forms of error, wickedness and delusion, the sons of our Church should themselves not be agreed; that there should be such great discrepancies in their faith, as those manifested on the question under consideration. But there is no good ground for lamentation in view of the fact that these discrepancies are drawn into the open blaze of day; that they are made the subject of theological discussion, and that the grounds upon which they claim severally to rest, are examined and explored. The truth has nothing to fear in these inquiries. God's truth is God's truth still, and has the promise of eternal duration, though there be mighty odds against it. We, at least, never could, and never can, coincide with those who look upon every controversy, not only as so much waste of time, but as of evil in itself, when it turns upon points of difference between so-called orthodox Protestant denominations. Neither can we join in the wholesale condemnation that is so frequently heaped upon our theological controversialists of the seventeenth century. Earnestness and tender conscientiousness in the maintenance and advocacy of the truth, once delivered to the saints, must necessarily, in this sublunary world of error and sin, evoke opposition and gainsaying. And our Church is evidently appointed of God to be a crying witness for the full, untarnished truth of the Redeemer's everlasting Gospel. Her main mission seems not to be so much to make extensive conquests, and to pitch her tents, externally, over the circumference of the earth, as rather to serve as a beacon light on the mountain tops, for the erratic wayfarer of other denominations; to be the salt to preserve from putrefaction the whole ecclesiastical body of Christ's kingdom; and to serve as the leaven to pervade eventually, with the force of its pure doctrine and unmingled truth, all Christendom. Though, therefore, the agitation of this subject should cause new alienations within our own ecclesiastical bosom, and create new parties—let the banner of our Confessions, at least, remain unsoiled by the fancies of her disloyal sons. For the sake of the whole kingdom of Christ on earth, for the sake of the Church at large, let the faithful sons of our Zion not despair at the multitude of their opponents, and the threatening results of the contest. All whose eyes have been opened, and whose reason has been thoroughly humbled and subjected by

the Holy Ghost to the entire teachings of inspiration, should recognize it as their heaven-imposed, solemn duty, to rally around, and cling to the God-given truth of our Symbols, and proclaim them from the house-tops, without surrendering one jot or tittle. And though the cry of "fanatic, illiberalist, narrow-minded, uncharitable," &c., should continue, and even increase in frequency; and though they should be reproached as sticklers for forms, and as destroyers of our Church's harmony, unity and piety, let them not be abashed, nor intimidated. For there can be no sound and healthy piety, where there is indifference toward error on the one hand, and the divine truth on the other. Piety commences with entire submission to God's revealed word in all its parts; with conscientious scrupulosity in its advocacy and defence; and has these for its abiding marks and tokens. True, the exhibition of it in any individual case may be a sham, just as any other mark of piety may be hypocrisy. But without such holy reverence for God's entire precious Word, all so-called piety will be more or less, unreal and ungenuine. For every error concerning the divine revelation and its doctrines and teachings, is an assault upon the majesty of our Lord, and an evidence of disloyalty; which the humble and truly conscientious disciple cannot brook without girding on the sword of the Spirit, and doing battle against it.

This revelation, we, as we trust, are divinely persuaded is correctly expounded and set forth also, concerning the nature of the ministerial office, in our confessions. The Great Head of the Church, as the footsteps of his government in it, as well as the Word of inspiration itself show, has special seasons and eras in the onward march of his kingdom, when he reveals to his children, in an unusual degree, and with special vouchsafements of his Spirit, the understanding of his oracles. Such a season or era in the Church's history we take the Reformation to have been. It was an act of peculiar, divine compassion, that the Gospel was then disentombed from the masses of human rubbish, superstition and abuses, and given to the Church anew. Christ, through his spirit-reared servant, Dr. Luther, then raised the long-prostrated candlestick of his Word, to illuminate the sinner's heart and pathway unto life eternal. And to the question, "Who say ye that I am?" which the Saviour propounds in his Gospel to every sinner, Luther and his co-adjutors and followers gave the answer, as recorded in our leading Confessions. These

Confessions are not inspired, but they are neither the productions simply of the minds of those who subscribed them, but the conscious, heart-felt utterances of what the Holy Ghost with super-abounding grace had wrought in their hearts, and had taught them in God's Word. This season of great and particular visitation of Divine mercy for that special purpose, has been given once for all. Other seasons may come for other purposes, but never for this again. The exalted Redeemer does not perform the same work over and over again in the guidance of his redeemed on earth, but rather points men to what he has already so signally done. Hence we cannot approve of Prof. Worley's course (in a recent number of this Review), in leaping over this illustrious monument of Divine mercy, and ignoring it in his investigation of the true nature of the ministerial office. We cannot approve of it, because we consider his view of the Church and of the Redeemer's presence in it, and direction of its course, as unsound and irreverential. As a symbolic Lutheran, he has undoubtedly the right, and even the duty, to disavow his adherence to our standards, if he is convinced that they teach errors. Neither is he deprived of the privilege, if after a course of years his former convictions are shaken as to the Scriptural character of all their teachings, to bring them to the test again of God's infallable Word, in order, either to remove his doubts, or else intelligibly to avow his rejection of them. But as long as he professes to believe them, he may not with impunity ignore them, and thus shut his eyes against the light of the Reformation, which the Lord has graciously given him; and which He, at least, will not consider as never having occurred. Refusing the landmarks and guides which God had so signally set up to direct his inquiry, we are not surprised to see, that he has been led beyond the pale of our Zion as divinely established in its Creed through the Reformation, and has travelled no small distance, through night and fog, back on the highway to the Vatican, from which God, through Luther, had brought forth his people. His bold attempt to walk alone has biased his exegesis, and has made it to point unmistakably towards Rome, as we shall have occasion to show below.

With regard to Mr. Worley's averment, "Our confessions, too, are not decidedly clear on this subject, because doubtlessly there was not as much prominence given it in the days of the Reformers and Fathers, as it has attained in our day," we can only say, "*Credat Judaeus Apella!*" Any one that

has read the writings of Luther and his fellow laborers with care, can, it seems to us, not have failed to perceive, that the question of the ministerial office was one of the main points upon which the controversy between the Romanists and the Reformers and Fathers turned. And hence Luther, very frequently, and at great length, speaks of the nature of the office, the manner of the proper call unto it, and the general priesthood of believers out of which it grows and in which it lies imbedded. *Vide* his *Ermahnung zum Frieden &c.*; *Verlegung der XII Art. der Bauernschaft*; *Von Heiligung des göttlichen Nahmens*; *Com. on Ps. 110*, and exposition of 1 Peter 2: 9; also *Chemnitz Examen de Sacramento Ordinis*. And that Melanchthon fully coincided with Luther in this respect, is perfectly evident from the Appendix to the Smalcald Articles which he himself drew up, and in which this matter is set forth *ex professo*. If these Confessions, however, should not be perfectly clear, as it is asserted (which nevertheless we cannot concede) all just rules of exegesis would require, that the private writings of their authors be used as the key to their proper understanding and exposition.

Moreover, Mr. W., says, that he has had occasion several times, in self-defence, to declare his conscientious difference from the brethren of the Missouri as well as from those of the Buffalo Synod on the doctrine of the Ministerial office. And in the "Lutheran Standard," he terms these two views "extremes" between which he claims to have found the *via media*. We cannot, however, discover this *via media* in his article. If we understand him at all, we consider him a full Grabauite in all essential points, and in some he even goes beyond his master. His article, then, cannot, in the nature of the case, contribute anything toward the reconciliation of the alienated. It simply takes side with the one party, whether avowed or not; and this circumstance the more urgently demands a presentation of the other side of the Missonri view, which we shall attempt in these pages, as far as we understand it.

Although, then, we do not approve of the course which he has adopted in the investigation of this subject, we have yet no objection to meet him on his own ground, namely, on that of the Scriptures alone. But in doing so, we shall not, as he has done, reject the helps which God has compassionately granted us in his Church. Whether our inquiry will be more or less Scriptural than his, by adopting this method, we re-

spectfully submit to the candid judgment of the christian reader.

The following propositions will, perhaps, cover the disputed ground, and will contain and avow the extreme "from which Mr. W., conscientiously" dissent. We place them in opposition to his battle array.

1. *The office of preaching consists essentially in the proclamation of the Word and the administration of the Sacraments.*

2. *This office is committed to the entire Church, or to the Church in the totality of its members, who hold it as royal priests.*

3. *The difficulty of disorder, which would result from the exercise of this office by all, is met by the declared will of Christ that certain qualified individuals should be formally invested with it.*

4. *The investment of any particular qualified person with the office is effected by the call unto it proceeding from the Church, or congregation, in which its functions are to be exercised.*

5. *Ordination, an apostolic practice, is the public sanction and confirmation of the call, or of the investment with the office; and should be retained in the Church.*

The failure to observe the obvious distinction which the Augustana makes between the office of preaching (*das Predigtamt*) abstractly considered (Art. V), and the ministerial office as viewed in a concrete sense (Art. XIV), has been the cause of endless confusion and scores of wild theories with regard to the subject of our present inquiry. In the economy of human salvation the office seeks the man (to use a Germanism). It exists, in the mind of God and the necessities of the Church, prior to the investment of any individual with it. The completion of man's redemption by Jesus Christ, and the giving of the means of grace unto the Church, for its establishment, perpetuation, growth and enlargement, create the necessity for such office. Our Lord himself, as the great Prophet whom Jehovah had promised to raise up for his people, exercised the prophetic office in the authoritative exposition of the law, and the promulgation of the Word of his divine kingdom. His office as Teacher or Prophet consisted altogether in this; and thus the Church of all ages has in Him the great exemplification of the functions of that office, which, after His ascension, he committed to her possession and use. The reiteration of his own teaching and the preaching of the story of his offices and work is the burthen of the

message with which his holy nation, which he purchased with his blood and gathered with his Word, is entrusted.

This we see, further brought out and exhibited in the commission of the apostles, to teach men to observe all things whatsoever their Master commanded them, to preach repentance in his name ; to teach all nations, baptizing them in the name, &c., to forgive and retain sin ; to bind and loose, &c. But all this looks little like constituting them a particular order or caste, over and above their christian order and station. The commission involves no special prerogatives and immunities ; but has direct and complete regard to service and ministration. And hence, when the apostles magnify their office, they do not tell us that they are anything above their fellow christians, but designate themselves by terms which are expressive of their ministrations and service. They are the Church's servants for Christ's sake, but not lords over God's heritage. Their office is not one of prerogative, but of duty and labor in the discharge of committed functions. In obedience to the injunction of his Lord, Peter stood up on the day of Pentecost and preached Jesus Christ to an assembled multitude. Paul proclaimed Jesus Christ and him crucified ; necessity was laid on him, so that woe was upon him if he preached not the Gospel of Christ. So also when they testified that Jesus is the Christ, they were administering the office. When Paul instructed the jailor at Philippi, he was prosecuting his calling as well as when he addressed the self-conceited and envious Athenians on Mars hill. Every confession of Jesus Christ with the mouth unto salvation, is a publication of the Lord and his Gospel. Timothy, who held the office of the New Testament, is instructed by the apostle of the Gentiles, not only to preach the Word publicly, but in season and out of season, to exhort, to entreat an elder as a father, and the younger men as brethren, &c., because these were all functions of the office committed to him. When those christians who were scattered abroad by a persecution at Jerusalem, and every where preached the Word they were performing the work of the great office of reconciliation, though they had not formerly been invested with it. In like manner Philip, both preached and baptized, and thus labored in the great office of preaching. In short, the office of preaching is the *verbal* Word (as our Symbols term it) as the Gospel in its presentation and administration unto men. Its forms may be different, but these will always be its essential requisites.

All the other offices of the Church have their origin and authority in this. The Word in its impartation and use, gives them their efficacy and sanctity. As it is the highest office which sprang from the apostolate, and was included in it; so it gives origin to all its collateral Church offices, which it comprises. The incumbents of the public office of preaching are termed elders, bishops, stewards, &c., while those of the subordinate offices are called deacons, h. e. servants, not only of God, but also of the Church and of bishops. Hence, we read that the apostles originally exercised the office of deacons in connection with the public office of the ministry; and only when the great increase of the Church made it necessary, were the forms committed to particular individuals. Every other public office of the Church, whether it be that of those elders who do not labor in the Word, or that of ruling, (Rom. 12 : 18), or that of deacons (in a restricted sense) or any office that is conferred on certain persons for public administration in the Church is to subserve the holy office of preaching and is a part and portion of it.

2. Having thus determined that by the office of the keys the sum and substance of the Gospel, or the office of preaching is meant, our second proposition will be easily established, notwithstanding the positive language of Mr. Worley to the contrary. He argues from Matt. 16: 16-20, and Matt. 28 : 14-20, that the keys, or the office of the ministry is not given to the entire Church, or to the Church in the totality of its members, but to the Church in her representative ministry. According to this view alone, he asserts, "can the Scriptures be made to harmonize with the Scripture order of salvation." In connection with this we have the ominous language: "For forgiveness of sin and grace unto eternal life are presented to men through the Church, in the means of grace, which become effective in their administration to him who submits to them, *when they are regularly presented to him.*" And this "effective" presentation, in his eye, takes place through the "special office of the ministry!" But, we ask, are the means of grace not effective unto salvation, if presented irregularly and by individuals not formally invested with the ministerial office? Is the Gospel not the power of God unto salvation in itself, no matter by whom it is proclaimed? Does the efficacy of the divinely-given means of grace depend upon the state or character of their administrator? We trow, not. When those believers came to Samaria who had been driven from Jerusalem by persecution,

and everywhere preached the Word, it had the same power and efficacy unto life eternal, as when Peter or Paul preached it. The wisdom and the spirit by which Stephen spoke in the synagogues of the Libertines, though only elected and ordained to serve tables, could not be restricted, Acts 4. And his memorable defence before the Jewish Sanhedrim ripened the Jews for the terrible judgments of Him who is not mocked, as well as when Peter and James spoke the Word.

But if the ministry alone can represent the Church (which our Church always denied against the arrogant claims of Papacy), as Mr. W., affirms, we cannot see what interest, right, or authority, according to his theory, it should represent. If the ministerial office is not committed to the entire Church, as he asserts, how can the ministry represent the Church in that office! Where there is a representation, there must be a something represented, and this something must be the possession of those who are thus represented. But if the Church, as such, does not hold the office of the keys and their administration; if they have not been conferred upon it by her Divine Master, it has nothing of which the ministry can be the representation in this capacity. Mr. W., makes the Church to confer on the ministry a representative power which he positively denies, that it possessed. And when he further remarks immediately below, "The second likewise must not be admitted because the authority of exercising this power is nowhere in the Scriptures given to persons indiscriminately, he involves himself in a vicious circle. The conference of the authority of exercising the power of the office, is surely the conference of the office itself. For, to confer an office, without the privilege of exercising its functions, would be child's play, and nonsense. The office consists in nothing else than in the authoritative exercise of its functions; and aside from this exercise there is no office. The office is the *preaching* of the Word, and the *administration* of the Sacraments. But the point to be proved, and which he has undertaken to prove from the passages referred to, is just this, that the authority for its exercise is not conferred upon the entire Church.

Prior to the solemn investiture of the apostles with the Gospel ministry by their departing Lord, they could not possibly be the representatives of the Church as ordained ministers. But they were believers in Christ; they were a spiritual Israel, and, by virtue of their faith, members of the mystical body of Christ. It is *after* the confession of Peter,

that Jesus is the Christ, and upon which confession, as a rock, the Church immovably rests, that the keys were committed to the disciples.

But that confession is not the confession of Peter alone, nor of him only as the spokesman of the other disciples, but the confession of the entire Church of all ages, and all climes, and of every living individual member in it, of whom Peter then was the mouth-piece. And hence the conference, immediately after, of the office of the keys in the Gospel ministry, did not apply to Peter merely, neither to his eleven fellow disciples alone, but to the Church of Christ in its totality. All, then, as the context clearly shows, who join with heart and mouth in the utterance of this confession, that Jesus is the Christ, because flesh and blood have not revealed unto them, but Christ's Father who is in heaven, have part in that office whose conference followed, and is conditioned by that confession. Peter, indeed, acted then as a representative of the Church, but not in the capacity of an office-bearer, but as the mouth of the Church, making confession, not unto the world and our brethren, but unto Christ, the Divine Giver of every gift.

That our exposition of this passage is correct appears most incontrovertibly from Matt. 18: 15-18, "Moreover, if thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone: If he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother.

But if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established.

And if he shall neglect to hear them, *tell it unto the Church*, but if he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican.

Verily, I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."

If anything can be clear, it is this, that the office of the keys which is above directly conferred upon Peter, is here declared to belong to Christ. The expulsion of the impenitent sinner from the Church, or the pardon of the penitent, is the exercise of the office of the keys, and is effected by means of the Word. The Church has no temporal power to wield. The authority by which she binds or looses, is the authority and power of the Word in its administration. "*Tell it unto the Church!*" But why tell it unto the Church, we may well

ask, if Mr. W.'s view is correct, that the power of the keys, which are, in this case, to be exercised, has not been conferred on it, and is not possessed by it to be exercised?

"his one explicit passage is a sufficient answer to Mr. W.'s further argument from our Lord's last interview with his disciples, in which he commissioned them to go and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them, and teaching them to observe all things whatsoever he commanded them. That the ministerial office was conferred upon the disciples by their Lord in this passage, Mr. W. himself emphatically affirms; and that the ministerial office is essentially the office of the keys, he likewise claims. But how the investiture of the apostles with this office is meant, we have learned from Matt. 18: 15-18; that, namely, when the Saviour invested the apostles with the office of the keys, he did it not in virtue of their representing the entire Church in the capacity of office-bearers to perpetuate the office of reconciliation by ministerial succession, but that in bestowing the office of the ministry upon the disciples, he bestowed it upon his Church of which Peter was the mouth-piece in making his memorable confession. For what is conferred upon the apostles in the one case, is declared to belong to the whole Church in the other. And it is the latter that must furnish the key for the understanding of the former, if we would have the Scriptures to harmonize with themselves. Neither do we find anything in the passage itself, upon which Mr. W., lays so much stress, to favor his assumption. It rather, together with the parallel passages, John 20: 21-23; Mark 16: 15; Luke 24: 46-47, goes to confirm the view above presented. In John 20, the risen Prince of Life salutes his disciples with the words, "Peace be with you"—language which expressed the nature of the boon, which he, as the Vanquisher of death, had brought them. Their hearts are first made to repose in the peace of their Lord, before they are sent forth. This is given them as the attending cordial upon their journeys in the discharge of the arduous office, with which they are forthwith invested. "Receive ye the Holy Ghost," the Saviour further addresses them. Instructive language! Unless we choose to adopt the Romish theory, that a minister may receive the Holy Ghost for his office, who is destitute, for his own personal salvation, of the unction from the Holy One, we cannot escape the conclusion, that the spiritual discipleship, the participation by faith, in the acquired gifts of

the risen Head of Zion, are the substratum upon which the apostolic commission rests, and in which it radicates. Because the disciples were in the Church which the Divine Teacher had gathered by his personal ministry, and had thus been made a royal priesthood, to show forth the virtues of Him who had called them out of darkness into his marvellous light, they were invested by the Lord, with the apostolate. The disciples were, in a sense, the Church of that place. And Mr. W., is sadly in error, when he affirms that "the ministerial office always precedes the congregation, in the sense of its administration by men." With Christ, the original Teacher, it is indeed antecedent to the Church; but with the apostles it is subsequent to the Church in their own spiritual membership of it. They are first a Church, for where two or three are gathered together in the Saviour's name, he is in the midst of them, and then messengers, sent forth by their Master to evangelize all nations, and kindreds, and tongues.

The correctness of our position, and of the view we have taken of the above passages, appears still further from the character and scope of the office with which the disciples were invested. The apostles are to forgive and retain sin according to John 20; and we have already seen from Matt. 19: 16-18, that this is an office which belongs to the entire Church, as Paul also writes to the Church at Corinth: "For whom ye forgive anything, I forgive also: for if I forgave anything, to whom I forgave it, for your sakes forgave I it in the person of Christ." The pardon which the apostle here requires of the Corinthians in behalf of a penitent sinner, had no reference to a personal wrong which he had committed against them, so that they should be charitable and forgiving towards him. The offender had been a scandal to the Saints, to the Church, and to the Divine Head of the Church; and the forgiveness for which the apostle entreats them, is none other than that of the exercise of the keys as involved in the apostles' office of reconciliation, as he also identifies his forgiveness, in the person of Christ with theirs. But if the office of forgiving and retaining sin is not conferred on the entire Church through the apostles, how could the apostle Paul charge it upon the entire Church at Corinth, as their solemn duty, to exercise it unto the forgiveness of the penitent sinner? To deny this, is to fall back under the arrogance and tyranny of the Papacy. So with the passage Matt. 28: 19-20. The apostles are to baptize, to preach re-

penitance in Christ's name, and to teach men to observe all things whatsoever Christ commanded them. Such are not functions which are restricted to the apostles and their successors in office; in Matt. 19 : 23, the Redeemer requires of all his followers, that they should confess him before men, which in the nature of the case cannot be done otherwise, than by the proclamation of Christ and him crucified, in whom the faith centres. And Peter, in his first epistle, 3 : 15, charges his readers to "be ready always to give an answer to every man, that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you." Bengel remarks *ad loc.*; *Non modo conversatio debet esse pulchra; de qua 2: 12. not. ad etiam quilibet paratus ad confessionem.* — *τὸν αὐτοῖς, ποσcenti).* "Inter ethnicos alii erant aperte mali, v. 16; alii dubitabant. his respondere comiter jubentur credentes—*πειδός, spei) quam fatentur, qui se in mundo peregrinari ajunt, et concupiscentias ejus vivant ** * * *Spes Christianarum saepe commovit alios ad percontandum.* Here, then, it is demanded of believers, generally, not only that they "serve God acceptably by prayer, praise and thanksgiving" to which Mr. W., would confine them, (p. 338), but that they should give a reason, should assign the ground of the hope that is within them. But the ground of that hope is Christ crucified, whom they should thus preach unto all that require it of them. Furthermore, we learn from apostolic history that this was the way in which the Church, from the beginning, understood the Saviour's injunction to preach repentance in his name. We read Acts 8 : 4, that when a persecution arose at Jerusalem, which resulted in the stoning of Stephen, the believers were compelled to flee and were scattered abroad. But without waiting for a formal investment with the ministerial office, by the imposition of the hands of the apostles, which Mr. Worley thinks meets the call, they went everywhere preaching the Word. They felt that, as believers in the Lord Jesus Christ, they were called, by virtue of their baptism, and their relation to the Head of the Church, to make confession of Him with the mouth unto salvation, and to proclaim forgiveness in His name; to preach the Word, wherever they did not encroach upon the equal rights of others, even without a regular, or formal call. In like manner Philip preached Christ in the city of Samaria, and baptized the eunuch of Ethiopia, although not formally invested with the ministerial office. And yet when the apostles at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the Word, by means of the preaching of these

laymen, they sent Peter and John, who, when they arrived at the place, and beheld what had been done, did not rebuke these believers as usurpers and intruders, as men who had preached without being sent, but rather rejoiced because of the good work which had been done. If Mr. W's. theory were right, that the office of preaching was not given to the whole Church, but only to the apostles and their successors in office, then Philip and his fellow-exiles would have been guilty of the most inexcusable presumption and intrusion. We justly conclude then, that, inasmuch as the functions of the apostolic office were and necessarily must always be exercised by all christians in various forms and with the restriction only which order and delegation impose, the office of preaching is given immediately and originally to the Church as a whole, or to the totality of its members.

Having thus, and, as we trust, fairly, by a due regard to the analogy of faith, and the express language of Scripture, taken the weapons out of our opponents' hands, and made them do willing service in our own cause, we proceed to a more ample confirmation of our proposition. We beg the reader not to be alarmed at the length to which our argument, on our second proposition, is growing. For this is the point upon which the whole controversy upon the question of the ministerial office ultimately turns. If we succeed in establishing this beyond all gainsaying, our remaining propositions will follow as a matter of course. Hence we must dwell upon it at large.

The saints, the redeemed, the Church in its spiritual membership, are the inheritors of all which Christ himself has, and can bestow in heaven and on earth. He loved his Church and gave himself for, and unto it, and with himself, all things. As his chosen bride, he has made her a participant in his own dignity, honor, riches, power and authority. And in the betrothal of the Heavenly Bridegroom with his chosen, redeemed, and sanctified bride, is necessarily implied the bestowal of all those offices, and all that authority which are requisite for her prosperity and well-being; to be used according to his own divinely-given prescription in his Word. To the entire Church the Lord has given and entrusted the means of grace, his Word and the Holy Sacraments, as it is admitted on all hands. But why not also the administration of these means, which they require to effect the purpose for which they were bestowed? Should the Lord have vouchsafed the greater and denied the less; should he have given the means

and withheld the authority to administer them? This is *a priori* more than improbable. Hence we find the contrary explicitly declared. Paul has the following language: Eph. 4: 11, "And he (Christ) gave some apostles; and some prophets; and some evangelists; and some pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints," &c. To whom has Christ given these? Certainly, to some individual, or community of individuals. It is evident from verse 8, where it is said, that Christ ascended on high, led Captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men, (unto the Church), that "*unto men*" or "*unto the Church*," is to be supplied in the eleventh verse. For the same construction continues through the entire passage. The meaning of it, however, is not only, that these offices have been given, by the ascended Lord, the Great Shepherd of souls, to his Church in as far as they are administered for her benefit; but also, in as far as they were *originally* instituted by Him. This appears beyond all controversy, as it seems to us, by a comparison of the passage with 1 Cor. 3: 21. Let there be no tampering with this explicit language! There is no analogy of faith which requires a departure from their literal sense. The words are these: "For all things are *yours*; whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come; all are yours; and ye are Christ's and Christ is God's!" As believers are Christ's, are subject unto Him, and derive their membership and calling from Him, so are apostles and pastors the Church's; derive their authority and office from the Church unto which the Redeemer has delegated it, and serve it in their office, gifts and labors. To the same import is the passage, 1 Cor. 12: 28. In his preceding discourse, the apostle had stated, "That God hath set the members, every one of them in the body, as it hath pleased him." He then continues, transferring the idea expressed concerning the natural body of man, over upon the mystical body of Christ, in the following passage: Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular. And God hath set *some in the Church*, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, &c. God hath set them *in the Church*; the Church, then, is antecedent to the office of apostles, prophets, teachers, and so forth, notwithstanding Mr. W's. emphatic assertion to the contrary. Moreover, these office bearers, according to the apostles, are members of the mystical body of Christ. Hence they do not stand above it, or over against it, but *in it*, and serve the Church, as laborers in the Word,

according to their particular gifts; just as in the natural body the different members, in their several stations, exercise their functions for the general good of the whole body.

Finally, the Scriptural character of our proposition is evident from the consideration, that all christians, by virtue of their baptism, are endowed with a spiritual priesthood. The passages upon which this doctrine is based are 1 Peter 2: 5; Rev. 1: 5-6, and 1 Peter 2: 9. In Rev. christians are said to have been made priests unto God, through Jesus Christ—1 Peter 2: 5, the apostle says: "Ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God," &c. These two passages speak of the relation of this holy priesthood unto God, and the manner of serving him, for which it qualifies, namely, to offer the spiritual sacrifices of prayer, praise, and thanksgiving in a way acceptable unto God. This seems perfectly clear; and so far we agree with Mr. W., in what he says concerning the general priesthood of all believers. But how it was possible for him to overlook the equally self-evident language in the third passage, we are not able to see. This brings out the other side of the christian's priesthood, that namely, which relates to the world and his fellow man. "Ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood * * * that ye should show forth the praise of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light." The praises here mentioned—what are they? *Ἄρεται* ("virtutes," "virtues," "Tugenden,") are the manifestation of those attributes in God, by which Peter's readers were called out of darkness, &c. But they had been called through the sending of the Divine Son into the world, and through the redemption which he accomplished, h. e. the Gospel, which is the story of God's love. These virtues they are to show forth "*verkündigen*," proclaim. For the meaning of the original "*ἰαγγίζειν*" is "to announce to those without, what is done within; to declare abroad, to publish," &c. Bengel observes "*εἰς in ιαγγίζειν innuit multorum ignorantiam, quibus fideles debent virtutes Dei praedicare.*" In like manner Luther, "The praises" (virtues), that is, that wonderful work of God which he has manifested unto you, in calling you out of darkness into his marvellous light. This you are to preach! as the highest office of your priesthood. And this should be the manner of your preaching, that you proclaim, *one to another* the great deeds of your God, by which, through Christ, whom he sent into the world, ye were redeemed from sin, hell, death and all

misery, and were called unto eternal life. In these things you should instruct others also, that they too might attain unto this "marvellous light." For this is the object, that you, in the first place, may perceive what God has done for you, to enable you then, also, as your highest duty, to proclaim it publicly, and call all men unto the light to which you yourself have been called. Wherever you find men who are ignorant of it, you are to instruct and teach them what you yourself have learned, namely, that man cannot come out of darkness unto the light and be saved, by human virtues and power, but only through the virtues and power of God." Com. on the first epistle of Peter, *ad loc.* And in his exposition of Ps. 110: 4, he remarks: "After we have been made christians by this Priest (Christ), and his priestly office, and have been inserted into Him by faith, through Baptism, we also obtain the right and authority, every one according to his vocation and station, to teach and confess to all men that Word which we have received of Him. For although we have not all been called unto the public office of the ministry, we should yet regard it as our duty, to teach, instruct, exhort, comfort and rebuke, through the Word of God, our neighbor who has need of it. Thus, parents should instruct their children and household; and brothers, neighbors, citizens, one another. For a christian will be able to teach others who are yet uninformed and weak, the Ten Commandments, the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, &c., and whoever hears it, is in duty bound to receive it of him as God's Word, and to confess it with him publicly." In strict keeping with the result which we have thus attained (as indeed, we might antecedently expect from the influence which Luther exerted in giving shape and matter to our Symbols), is the teaching of our Confessions. We quote only the leading passage: *Ad haec necesse est fateri, quod claves non ad personam unius certi hominis, sed ad ecclesiam pertineant, ut multa clarissima et firmissima argumenta testantur. Nam Christus de clavibus dicens, Matt. 18: 19, addit: Ubicanque duo vel tres consenserint super terram, &c. Tribuit igitur principaliter claves ecclesiae et immediate; sicut et ob eam causam ecclesia principaliter habet jus vocationis.* Ap. to Smal. Art.

We have reached the point in our investigation under the second proposition, to reverse Mr. W's. argument (p. 337), and state it thus: If we find two things (in this case the office of preaching and the general priesthood of believers) presented in the Scriptures with a close and essential connec-

tion stated as existing between them, and when at the same time they propose to effect similar objects and aims, it would be extremely abhorrent to all true rules of Biblical rendering, to say that the two had not the same aim, and were not in some way closely related. The prime and essential object of the ministerial office is, beyond doubt, that of teaching the Gospel, &c. But does the Scriptural presentation of the general priesthood propose any such object or make any such requirement? The sacred oracles, as we have seen, give us a very clear affirmative. And hence we take our proposition as established.

3. Our third proposition grows out of the necessity of things and the requirement of order in the Church, and rests upon a positive enactment of Christ. Though the office of the keys has been conferred upon the whole Church, it does not follow, that all, in their own persons, under all circumstances, and in all places can actually exercise it. All christians are originally called to proclaim the virtues of Him who has called them out of darkness into his marvellous light. But all these who are thus called, are a community of believers, a spiritual organism composed of many members of which Christ himself is the Head. But where, in a spiritual commonwealth, all have equal rights and duties for certain public ministrations and offices unto which those rights relate, it is self-evident, that the use of those rights, in person, by all equally, could not take place without either a reciprocal infringement of the rights of another, or else the production of wild disorder and ungodly confusion. But God is a God of order, not only in his general Sovereignty and Government of the Universe, but especially in his Church, and among his Redeemed, Disorder with regard to things divine, is a violation of that law of order which controls all of Jehovah's dealings and dispensations; and therefore a grievous sin. And when men speak rather disparagingly of a "mere question of order" with regard to the ministerial office, as though this were a matter of little consequence, they seem to be sadly in the dark concerning the true and proper Scriptural idea of order. If we therefore urge the claims and requirements of christian order, as forbidding the equal exercise publicly of equal rights originally possessed by all spiritual priests, we mean, that a divine law, divinely announced by Christ and imposed upon the Church, prohibits it. This is no mere human arrangement or policy, but an eternally abiding principle in the nature of God, and, as such, promulgated unto his obedi-

ent people. But wherever this God-given law is not infringed, the believer needs no other call, than that which is given him through Holy Baptism, and which grows out of the nature of his fellowship with the Redeemer, for the exercise of all the functions of the office of preaching. He may preach the Word in season and out of season; he may reprove, rebuke and exhort with all long-suffering and doctrine, as Timothy is charged to do, and as Philip and his fellow-exiles, according to apostolic history, actually did. However, the matter assumes quite another aspect, when the claims of order come into play, for which case a positive institution of the Saviour has provided. No encroachment upon, and interference with the divinely granted rights and duties of one believer by another, may be committed without incurring the Lord's displeasure, and violating his law. But in an assembly of christians, who are gathered together in their exalted Redeemer's name, no one member, can, of his own accord, get up and publicly teach and preach the Word, without doing that for which all have equal and the same rights; and thus trampling upon them. On the other hand, if all were alike, and at the same time, to preach and teach publicly, that confusion and disorder would ensue which are explicitly prohibited by the Word of inspiration. Hence the necessity of the ministerial office, or, in other words, the necessity of delegating unto one individual, and investing him with the public office of the ministry. And this office will then not merely be a representative office of the congregation, as Mr. W., groundlessly supposes, any more, than according to his theory, it would be a representative office of the ministry who confer it; but a truly and entirely divine office, because originally given to the Church by the Son of God, and only delegated by it to its elected servant. The Church can confer no other office upon the minister than that which itself has received from Him who instituted it. There can, therefore, be no well-grounded fear of any degradation of the ministerial office, according to the view we have taken of the matter.

But the office of reconciliation as thus originated and conferred, is by no means *identical* with the general priesthood of believers. The office of preaching which all christians originally and immediately hold from Christ, as already identical, is of larger scope and wider application, though by no means of higher authority, than the office of the ministry. It is the presentation of the Word in all its forms, under all

circumstances, and amidst all relations of mankind. Whereas, the ministerial office is the ministrative of this priestly office of all believers, only in so far as it cannot be exercised by all, without confusion and reciprocal encroachment. The presentation of the means of grace through the office of the ministry, is that ministration, which results from the relations and nature of the community of saints in the Church of Christ. Hence, when the members of the Church invest a qualified individual with the ministerial office, they have not delegated their entire priesthood to him, nor have they ceased to be priests, whose duty it is to proclaim the virtues of Him by whom they have been saved. But the exercise of their priestly office is then to be help within those bounds and limits, which the establishment of the ministerial office in their midst has fixed and settled. They can, of course, then not exercise the functions of that office which they have conferred upon another in so far forth, as this has been done, and as the ministerial office prohibits.

This brings us to the divine institution itself. Dr. Hoefling's theory is, that there is, indeed, a moral and evangelical necessity for the Gospel ministry, but no divine institution, no positive enactment. But it is here, as we think, his theory is at fault. It is not so much wrong in positive errors, as it is in stopping short of the whole truth, and in failing to do full justice to the entire character of the office, and all the Scriptural relations concerning it. That there is such a moral and evangelical necessity for the promulgation of the Gospel, is indisputable. However, is this all? With all deference to those who differ from us, we are compelled, by Scripture, to answer with an emphatic "No!"

We have not treated *ex professo* of the divine ordination of the office of preaching, in which the ministerial office is included. We deemed it unnecessary, believing that the whole course of our investigation would put that far beyond any rational doubt. But if it can claim a divine institution for itself, and contains the office of the ministry as *continens* the *contentum*, it is evident, that the latter is alike divinely instituted. Besides, the Scripture record of the solemn official investiture of the disciples declares it. The mandate to go and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them, &c., is attended with the promise, "Lo, I am with you, even unto the ends of the earth." It bears all the characteristics of a divine institution. We have first the command to go and teach, and baptize; and then the encouraging promise of the

Redeemer's presence for blessing and prospering the work, even unto the ends of the earth, attached to it. The commission to teach must be of equal extent and duration with the promise by which it is attended. The one conditions the other, and is commensurate with it. And as the ministration of the Word, by means of the commission to make disciples of all nations, is of perpetual force, the office which has it to do with this especially, must be so likewise. This appears still more clearly, if possible, from Matt. 28. The mandate here is not only that the apostles themselves should preach and baptize, but also that they should teach men to observe all things whatsoever their Divine Master commanded them; which certainly comprised the injunction to publish the Gospel by means of the ministerial office with which he then invested them. In full consonance with this understanding of the passages under consideration is the language of Paul to the Elders of the Church at Ephesus. His exhortation is, Take heed, therefore, unto yourselves, and unto all the flock over which the *Holy Ghost* hath made you overseers, &c., Acts 20: 28. Though these elders had been called mediately and by human instrumentalities, it is yet said that the *Holy Ghost* had placed them in office. If this office, however, were a human arrangement, or simply the result of a moral and evangelical necessity, it could not, with possibility, be attributed directly to the Divine Spirit himself. To the same effect are the passages Eph. 4: 11, and 1 Cor. 12: 28-29, "And *He* (*Christ*) gave some apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers." "And God hath set some in the Church, first apostles; secondarily prophets; thirdly teachers," &c. God himself, then, hath set, not only apostles, but also prophets and teachers. Christ, the Lord of the harvest, gave to his Church both apostles and teachers. Moreover, Paul writes to the Romans (chapter 10), "How shall they preach without being sent?" h. e. without a proper vocation. But where a call is needed there must be a definite office to which it relates. Finally, though the apostles held their office directly from the Lord himself, they still regarded their fellow-laborers in the Word who had received no more than a mediate call, as their compeers and equals. In 1 Cor. 4: 1, (compared with 1: 1), Paul places himself on a level with Sosthenes, declaring that they were both servants of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God. The same apostle (Phil. 2: 25) terms Epaphroditus his companion in labor, and fellow-

soldier and the messenger (apostle) of the Philippians; and Tychicus (Col. 4 : 7), his fellow-servant in the Lord. The apostle John (II John and III John, 1) also styles himself an elder. Peter, too, (1 Peter 5 : 1) claims for himself nothing more than other elders, when he writes, "The elders which are among you, I exhort, which am also an elder," &c.

4. Our fourth proposition has a long argument of Mr. Worley's to combat. Yet we hope it will not be a tedious nor a lengthy task. Mr. W., labors with might and main to establish the chimera of a two-fold call to the ministerial office. The office itself is conferred by the ordained ministry, he thinks, and then a call from the congregation is requisite for particular ministrations of the office. Now there are many and mighty objections against this view. In the first place, he leaves the reader in the dark as to the distinction between the office itself, and its special ministrations. If the office is something aside from the presentation and administration of the divinely given means of grace, it must, as far as we can see, either be the Popish "*character indelebelis*," or else an exceedingly sublime and etherialized something which utterly eludes our understanding. But he himself defines the ministerial office to be essentially the *preaching and teaching* of the Word and the *administration* of the Holy Sacraments. What, then, are its particular administrations? Has the minister of a pastorate other, and more particular ministrations to perform than the presentation of the Gospel in all its different forms? We can neither perceive, nor even imagine what these particular ministrations should be over and above the functions of the office itself. With all deference to Mr. W.'s, logic and penetration we are compelled to pronounce them visionary, cabalistic dreams which have no existence except in his fertile fancy.

Moreover, his second proposition has several other features which give the whole a rather singular physiognomy. He first labors at great length to show that the keys have not been given to the entire Church, but only to the apostles as office bearers, and through them, to their successors in office. The Church possesses the means of grace, he thinks, but not that office by which these are mainly dispensed and applied to the evangelization of the world. Still, he allows a portion of the right and authority of the call to the Church. If the office of reconciliation, however, has not been entrusted to it, whence, then, comes the right and authority of calling unto the ministrations of the office? Surely, the congregation or

Church cannot dispense, or help to dispense an office which it never held, either alone, or conjointly with the ordained ministry. The citizens of our country elect a President, because the Presidential office lies originally with them as a sovereign people. They can delegate no immunities, rights, authorities, and powers, except those which they themselves possess. So with the Church. If the office of the New Testament has not been given to the whole Church, or congregation, as Mr. W., affirms, then the call proceeding thence to authorize a qualified individual to break the bread of life unto it, would not only be mere show and parade, but a sinful arrogance, by meddling and tampering with matters over which it has no control, and by pretending to confer an office, of some sort, which it never held as its own. It must be apparent to the blearest eye, that the assignment of the call to the ministry unto the public office bearers of the Church, and not unto the entire Church itself, is such a gigantic stride toward Rome, that all attempts to check it afterwards must prove utterly fruitless, by even the faintest sense of consistency and logical sequence. Either the Lutheran theory or the Popish, —*tertium non datur*.

Again, Mr. Worley remarks (p. 225), "We conceive the general call to be met in ministerial ordination, after due preparation and examination of the candidate." Now ministerial ordination either confers the office or it does not confer it. If the former, a second call or investiture from the congregation would not only be a totally needless superfluity, but also a virtual declaration that the call from the ministry was invalid. For why call a man unto an office of which he has already been made the incumbent? Furthermore, as the ministerial and congregational call are not contemporaneous, nor necessarily so dependent upon one another, that if the first is given, the second must invariably follow; we might, and in many cases, actually would have public functionaries of Gospel ministrations, who could nowhere find a place in which to exercise their office, except, perhaps, in the airy regions.

Mr. W's. theory being thus inconsistent with itself, and in the nature of the case, impracticable, we may antecedently rest assured that it is altogether foreign to the teaching of the Holy Oracles. It is true, he quotes quite an array of passages, and labors faithfully to make them do service in his cause, but, as we think, utterly without success. In his citations of Scripture, and in his arguments generally with which

he seeks to prop his view, he looked too much to their "quantitas" and too little to their "quiditas" and "qualitas." His two-fold call theory he finds already indicated in the manner in which the eleven disciples received their commission to evangelize the world. He observes (p. 323), In the command, "Go ye forth," &c., they were invested with the office, although they were not permitted to go forth to its service, till they had received the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost. But is the effusion of the Spirit, under whose guidance and direction they proceeded to their work, identical or even analogical to the call of the congregation to particular ministrations under investment with the office; with which Mr. W., identifies it? Surely, to bring the two into any essential relationship requires the largest stretch of fancy. The call is never more than the virtual investiture of the candidate with the functions and powers of the office; whereas the outpouring of the Holy Ghost upon the apostles, was not a second call nor a public sanction and confirmation of the first, but an inward capacitation and equipment for its proper and blessed exercise. And what can the fact prove that not the Church, but our Lord himself called the apostles? Their call was direct and immediate. And no one denies the right to the Great Divine Prophet to call into his vineyard whomsoever he pleases. The question, whence the mediate call legitimately proceeds, whether from those already in the public office, or from the Church, and not, by any means, whether Christ himself may not call entirely without means; concerning which all are agreed. Mr. W.'s argument upon this point is therefore altogether irrelevant. He seems to have missed the *status controversiae*.

Neither can we discover anything in the call of the great apostle of the Gentiles, in any way, to favor Mr. W.'s view of a two-fold call. After Ananias had laid hands on him (Acts 9: 17)—this he takes to have been the general call—he straightway preached Christ in the synagogues. And afterwards, when the teachers at Antioch send him forth with the imposition of hands to the work to which the Holy Ghost had called him, this, Mr. W., thinks, was the call unto "particular ministration under investment with the office," he preached Christ again both in the synagogues and on Mars hill, and at other places. But wherein, we would like to know, were these latter ministrations different, or more particular than the former? Then he preached Christ just as he did after the second imposition of hands. And if preaching

Christ in the first case is the general office, what would be its particular ministrations? If the former be the general head, what would be its special subdivision? And wherein was the apostle's office restricted and limited through the second imposition? To ask the question is to refute it. Or does Mr. W., mean that the first laying on of hands constituted Paul a metropolitan bishop or catholic Pope, of some sort, over all Christendom, and the second degraded him to a common parish priest? And, moreover, what connection is there between the prophets and teachers at Antioch fasting and laying hands on the apostles; and the call given by a congregation for particular ministration of the Gospel ministry? Certainly, none at all.

Finally, Mr. W., finds language to indicate the distinction between the general call and the call unto particular ministrations in the passage (Acts 14: 23), "And when they had ordained them elders in every Church," &c. His comment is: "Here we have the ordination of elders by the apostles, and for the congregations brought out distinctly and yet in connection. Very well! But where is there anything in the passage, either expressed or implied, of a general call through ordination and a special call through congregational election and installation? That the apostles, as the public functionaries of the Church attended to the ceremony of ordination is just what we claim properly belongs to the public office of preaching, but is far from indicating, in any way, that they first invested the candidate with the Gospel ministry in general, and then held a congregational election and installation for its particular ministrations.

Having thus seen that the idea of a two-fold call is entirely without any Scriptural relation to rest upon, we need not notice at large Mr. Worley's elaborate discussion to prove from the Divine Record, that ordained ministers alone give the general call. In his comment upon passages which treat of the ordination of elders, the imposition of hands, &c., he takes something for granted which it was his imperative duty first to have proved and established. His entire reasoning upon this part of his theory, brought within the nut-shell of a syllogism stands thus: Ordination is the general call to the ministry. The apostles and their co-laborers ordained; *ergo*, the apostles and their co-laborers alone had the right to call at that time, and only their successors in office have it now. Hence, when he finds a passage which speaks of the ordination of elders, the laying on of hands, &c., he forth-

with exclaims, "*Eureka! Eureka!*" But his jubilee is premature. The premise of his syllogism is disputed by those whose view he is combating. *Hic labor! hoc opus est!* If ordination is not the call, as we affirm, and as our Church has always taught, but simply the confirmation and public declaration of it, then the fact that the apostles, prophets, and public teachers ordained others for the Gospel ministry, cannot prove that the call for this holy office, in a general way, is in the hands of those who have been invested with it; but simply that, ordination being a public act which requires the public ministration of the Word in prayer and invocation, it legitimately appertains to the Church's office-bearers. And when we read in the Acts of the Apostles that they are ordained ministers, and there is no explicit mention made of congregational elections and calls, we must bear in mind that this inspired book of the Canon professes (as its caption shows) to give chiefly the *acts of the apostles*, and only in a subordinate sense, the record of the congregations established through their Word. Besides, silence on the part of the divine penmen in one case, or more concerning a particular matter, can furnish no argument against it, if in other passages treating of the same matter, it is expressly mentioned. So with Paul's charge to Titus (chap. 1: 5) to ordain elders in every city on the island of Crete. Here, it is true, as Mr. W., intimates (p. 330), that the instruction concerning the setting apart new ministers, is given to him who is already in office, and not to congregations directly. But he should have remembered that the epistle is addressed to Titus, a public functionary, and not to any particular congregation; hence it quite naturally sets forth the part which *he* should take in the setting apart of believers for the ministerial office, namely to ordain them; whilst the rights and duties of the congregations, as not lying within the scope of the purpose of the letter, are passed over. And when Paul requests Timothy (II Tim. 1: 6) to stir up the gift of God which is in him by the putting on of his own (Paul's)hands, he does not say what Mr. W., makes him say, that this gift of God is the office of the ministry, but rather, as text and context clearly show, an endorsement and qualification which God had given him in answer to prayer, as attended with the laying on of Paul's hands. Not otherwise is it with the direction to lay hands suddenly on no man (1 Tim. 5: 22). By what rules of Biblical rendering Mr. W., can construe this language to mean, "call no man suddenly into the Holy of-

fice of the Gospel," we cannot perceive. Its import into the Holy office of the Gospel," we cannot perceive. Its import evidently is, as we learn from the clause "*neither be partaker of other men's sins*" attached to it, that he should not be hasty and rash in confirming and sanctioning, through the laying on of his hands, a call given by other men, and thus participating in their sin. With singular misfortune, Mr. W., missed the proper meaning of II Tim. 2: 1-2, "Thou, therefore, my son, be strong in the grace that is in Christ Jesus. And the things thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others." The apostle proceeds in his admonition upon the ground that Timothy was his spiritual son whom he had begotten in Christ Jesus by the Gospel, which he had declared unto him. The things which Timothy had heard before many witnesses he is bidden to commit also to others. What these things were, we learn from 1 Tim. 6: 12, where Timothy is exhorted to fight the good fight of faith, to lay hold on eternal life, whereunto he was also called and had *confessed a good confession before many witnesses*. This has reference to his personal salvation. He had made a good confession of the Gospel truths before many witnesses, when he was received into the Church of Christ. In this good confession, which he, as Paul's own son, had learned from him, he is admonished to abide, and to commit it to faithful men. He is to teach it them, that they may themselves be saved, and be enabled to teach others also. The manner, however, how they are to be called, after they have been instructed and prepared is here neither expressed, nor indicated. The Theological professors of our seminaries instruct their pupils to be able to teach others also, but they do not thereby call them into the ministry. The latter is altogether a different and separate thing. So in the former case.

Neither can the circumstances that Paul and Titus are told what qualifications, talents and character they must look for in candidates for the public office of the Gospel, disprove the doctrine that the call comes legitimately from the Church. Every regularly organized Church or congregation consists, in its outward form, essentially of teachers and hearers, who together, not separately, give the call. Hence it was most needful for these ministers to know what qualifications are requisite for this public office; both for the instruction of their hearers to enable them to exercise their right of calling

properly, and investing the suitable person with the office, (as we read Acts 6: 5, the apostles actually did); and also for capacitating them to act their own part in the giving of the call in a manner acceptable to God. That the congregations are not mentioned in this connection, grows out of the circumstance that the letter is a *pastoral*, and not a *congregational* epistle.

If, then, there is nothing in Scripture which disproves our proposition, we can, with the greater confidence of success, proceed to the positive establishment and confirmation of it. We translate from Chemnitz "Examen," to serve, not as a sanction of our view simply, but as a substitute of what we might have to say. In controverting the Popish view (and thereby also Mr. Worley's) he remarks: "When one was to be chosen to fill the place of Judas, Peter presented the matter, not only to the apostles, but also to the rest of the disciples; for this was the name which believers then bore, who were there assembled to the number of one hundred and twenty. Peter showed from Scripture what kind of a person should be chosen, and how the election should proceed; which was attended with prayer. Though lots were cast, because the call was not to be entirely mediate, but apostolic, yet this was not considered a binding precedent; for afterwards lots were not employed. When (Acts 6: 2 seq.) deacons were to be chosen and called, the apostles did not arrogate to themselves alone, this right, but convoked the Church. Still, they did not entirely renounce the care and supervision of elections, by committing them to the blind and unregulated action of the people and multitudes; but directed and regulated them. They gave instruction, teaching the proper person to be called, and the manner in which the election should be conducted. Then the individuals chosen were placed before the apostles, so that, by their approbation, it might be made manifest that they were properly called. Furthermore, the apostles confirmed the election by prayer and the imposition of hands. According to Acts 14: 23, Paul and Barnabas ordained elders in every Church, which they had gathered and organized through their ministry. They did not, however, assume to themselves the right and authority of the election and call, as appears from the language of Luke, who employs the term "*zupotomavtes*," which is used II Cor. 8: 19, to designate an election which is made by the voice and suffrages of the Church. This vocable, namely, which is derived from the custom among the Greeks, of voting by hold-

up their hands. It signifies the election of any one by the casting of votes or the indication of consent. Hence, Paul and Barnabas did not obtrude elders upon the Churches contrary to their will and consent. In like manner, when certain persons (Acts 15: 22) were to be chosen to be sent with messages to the Church at Antioch, Luke says, "Then pleased it the apostles and elders, with the whole Church, to send chosen men of their own company to Antioch, with Paul and Barnabas," &c. It is, however, necessary to observe in apostolic history that sometimes the ministers and congregations conjointly proposed and elected those whom they considered qualified for the office, Acts 1: 23. At other times the congregation attended to the presentation and election, and then submitted the result to the judgment of the apostles for approbation or dissent. Acts 6: 5-6. Frequently the apostles, who could judge best of these matters, proposed certain persons whom they considered qualified to the congregations, whose call was regarded valid, as soon as it received the suffrages and consent of the Churches. Thus Paul sent Timothy, Titus, Sylvanus and others to the Churches. In like manner, elders were proposed (Acts. 14: 23) who were accepted by the Churches *per consensum*. At times some offered their services to the congregations, as we learn from 1 Tim. 3: 1, where it is said, "If a man desire the office of a bishop, he desireth a good work." In every case, however, in apostolic times, the consent of the congregation, and the opinion and confirmation of the presbiteries were had and required for a regular and legitimate call. Titus was left in Crete to guide and direct the elections of the presbyteries, that it might be properly conducted, and to sanction and confirm, through ordination, the legitimate call thus given. For Paul employs the same word, Titus 1: 5, where he speaks of ordaining elders in every city, which also occurs Acts 14: 23, by which the election of the people and the ordination of the presbyters is expressed.* He also commands Titus to re-

* We take pleasure in citing a witness for our doctrine from the Presbyterian Church. Dr. Breckinridge (in his *Knowledge of God*, &c., p. 644) remarks: "Nor can any one be lawfully called to a permanent and ordinary office, except by the congregation he is to serve in the Lord; nor can any office bearer be set in any office in a congregation, except by its own vocation. It is thus that God has guarded his Church against intruders and impostors. It is thus that the Bride of the Lamb accepts the ascension gifts of her head and Lord. It is thus that ultimate power is lodged by Christ, in that royal priesthood which constitutes the holy nation, whereby the whole government of the Church takes its

buke those sharply who are not sound in the faith, and do not teach the truth; which is equivalent to what he says 1 Tim. 5: 22, with more explicit language: "Lay hands suddenly on no man; neither be partakers of other men's sins," namely, by approving of an election and call which have not been given in a regular way. These examples of apostolic history clearly show that the election and call of ministers belong, in a definite manner, unto the entire Church, so that both the presbytery and the people (of which every fully and regularly organized congregation is composed) participate in them. And this apostolic form of election and calling was also retained and used in the Church of later times." Exam. II. Loc. 18, page 226.

With this masterly dissertation of our great Chemnitz, we are willing to drop this part of our subject, noticing only a few objections which Mr. Worley makes to one point therein alluded to. He remarks, "The instance concerning which so much has been made, viz, the election and ordination of an apostle in the place of the traitor Judas, we are very clearly persuaded by several considerations, is not a real exception to this rule" (of ministers alone extending the general call). These considerations are, that among the one hundred and twenty disciples who were there gathered together, some were doubtlessly women, who were not allowed a voice in these and other public matters; that the apostle Peter, in his address does not call upon the whole company to take part in the choice, and that the language in the latter part of the relation is such that it cannot be said, beyond question, to include all present in the vote or lot which was cast. We remark in reply, that the assumption that "apart from the women, the evangelists and apostles formed the whole company," is not only improbable, but altogether incredible. We know of no more than eleven whom the *risen* Saviour had called into the public ministrv of his Word. That one hundred and nine of that assembly were women, can only be supposed by him—*sit venia verbo*—who has a hopeless cause to defend. The address, "*men and brethren*," little intimates Mr. W's. conjecture that the assembly was almost exclusively composed of *women and sisters*. No, every circumstance of the whole transaction duly weighed—that, namely, v. 15 commences a new paragraph, that the address runs "*men and brethren*," that women were generally prohibited from participating in start in the bosom of the christian congregation, and is perpetuated only by their perpetual action."

any transaction like the one that was to be attended to here, rather leads to the belief that among the one hundred and twenty disciples there congregated, there were no women. There is, at least, not the faintest feature about the whole scriptural relation, to make us suspect the contrary. But even if some were present, their interests were represented by their husbands—1 Tim. 2: 11, 12.

Finally, the other conjecture, that whilst Peter set forth the necessity of an election, and that one should be chosen "of these men which have accompanied with us, all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us," meant that only his ten fellow-apostles had need of this instruction to make a proper choice, as it concerned them alone, is at least a match to Dr. Carlstadt's exegetical *chef-d'œuvre* upon the institutional words of the Eucharist, by which he made our Saviour to take bread, bless it, and give it to his disciples, saying (then pointing to his natural body before them) take, eat, this is my body which sits here before you, &c. Thus Mr. W. would have the apostle to address the one hundred and twenty disciples concerning the election, showing its necessity and the men from whom they should select one, while he intended it secretly for the apostles only, who were soon to attend to a matter before the whole multitude which concerned only themselves. Verily, with such rules of Biblical exposition, which Mr. W. adopts to get around an explicit, and to his theory, unwelcome and stubborn passage, the following old rationalistic maxim with regard to the Bible is easily verified: "*Hic liber est, in quo sua querit dogmata quisque, invent et pariter dogmata quisque sua.*"

5. Our last proposition is fully implied in the third and fourth propositions, and naturally and necessarily grows out of them. The ceremony of the laying on of hands, attended with prayer and invocation, was of wide application in apostolic times. The apostles not only laid hands on those who were entrusted with the public office of preaching, but also upon the deacons who had been elected by the Church at Jerusalem, upon the sick (Mark 16: 18), upon the new converts at Samaria, &c. With Paul the ceremony was twice performed—the first time, immediately after his miraculous conversion—and the second time, by the prophets and teachers at Antioch. Yet it can claim no "*Thus saith the Lord,*" no divine institution for itself. We nowhere read of its divine ordination in the Scriptures. It always appears simply as a solemn rite which the apostles and public teachers prac-

ticed. And hence, to make it identical with the ministerial call, which is divinely enjoined, is a species of idolatry. "How shall they preach, unless they be sent?" Rom. 10: 15, shows that the sending, the call, is absolutely necessary and divinely commanded; but to identify it with ordination, as Mr. W. has done, is to exalt an adiaphoron to the dignity of a divine institution. And then we would have reason to doubt, whether the twelve apostles themselves did not preach without being sent; for we nowhere read that the Saviour ordained them with the laying on of hands.

Its signification and import appear from Acts 9: 17; and Acts 13: 1—3.* After Paul had been directly called by him whom he persecuted, as his chosen vessel to bear his name before the Gentiles, and kings, and the children of Israel, Ananias laid hands on him, evidently not to repeat what the Lord had previously done, but to confirm and recognize it, and to invoke upon him the gift of the Holy Ghost, of which the laying on of hands was the symbolic expression. So with the other passages referred to. Not till after the Holy Ghost had said, "Separate me Barnabas and Saul, for the work whereunto I have called them," did the teachers and prophets lay their hands on them, and send them away. Here again, the imposition of hands attended with prayer, could only have been the public expression and confirmation of the previously given divine call, connected with the invocation for blessing and aid of the Lord in whose work they were to engage.

And for this reason the rite, though not *enjoined* in the Scriptures, should be retained in the Church. It is a safe-

* Mr. Worley styled the declaration of the last General Conference, that ordination being the confirmation of the call, it was wrong to ordain missionaries, "*Missouri Quakerism*," and set over against it, as its opposite, with great confidence of victory, the passage Acts 13: 2, 3. But we are compelled to say that this passage, so far from proving anything against the view expressed by Conference, speaks entirely in its favor, and utterly refused to establish anything on his side of the question. For it explicitly says, that the Holy Ghost *had* called Paul and Barnabas for the work of the ministry, before hands were laid on them. Conference objected to the ordination of missionaries, on the ground of the absence of the condition which had here been given. But if their fellow-christians should see fit to perform certain ceremonies, such as fasting and the laying on of hands, at their going forth, no one, we suppose, would object, if they were not regarded, either as the conference of the office, or as the confirmation of it, when it had not been given by those among whom their ministrations were to take place, and who alone, as we have shown, have the right to call.

guard against deceivers, against those who run, and God has not sent them. And the believing candidate, looking unto the precious promises of God's Word, which are given to his ministry, can rest assured that the united prayers and supplications of the Church which ascend to the throne of grace for him and the blessed discharge of her office, will be attended with an effusion of heavenly gifts upon him.

But we must bring our article to a close. We hope our friend, whose view it became our duty to oppose, will not take anything we have said amiss. Our remarks are directed against his teachings which, we feel convinced, jeopard some of the most sacred inheritances of our Church, and of our highly-cherished truths, and are ruinous in themselves; but not against his person and character. Believing that he was building wood, hay and stubble upon the foundation which is laid, and which is Jesus Christ, we have endeavored, in our feeble way, to clear it of the rubbish. May the Lord of all mercy find our work in consonance with his will, and bless it to the advancement of truth, and the glory of his holy name!

ARTICLE III.

OUR WANT AND OUR DUTY.*

By Rev. D. H. Focht, A. M., New Bloomfield, Pa.

To teach mankind the fear and love of God, is the great mission of the Church. Her text-book is the Bible. The contents of this book she is to give to a dying world. To do this, she must have the requisite men and means. Her working force must be equal to her mission; and as her mission contemplates the conversion of the whole world, so her men and means must be sufficient to extend the invitations and blessings of the Gospel to the whole world. Formerly some nations were inaccessible to the ambassador of the cross; but now there is scarcely a people, to which a highway has not been opened, and with whom the missionary does not meet with favor and success. Having broken down every opposing

* An Address delivered before the Education Society of the Central Synod of Pennsylvania, at Duncannon, Perry Co., Pa., May 12, 1860.—Published by request.

hindrance to the spread of the Gospel, God invites and commands the Church to enter the great harvest-field and reap for the kingdom of heaven. If the Church would not be recreant, she must accept the invitation and obey the command by faithfully doing the work assigned her. The world is to be converted to God by the diligent use of the means and instrumentalities He has appointed. It is a principle in the Divine economy, always to provide means adequate to the work to be performed. The Church is, therefore, without excuse, and becomes culpable in a fearful degree, if she does not perform that work. We may be assured that if God has a work for the Church to do, he has also furnished her with the means by which to do it. Jesus says, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature." Here is pointed out the specific work the Church has to do, and here is given the imperative command to do it. As we cannot suppose that God would command the Church to do a thing, and yet withhold from her the very means by which she is to do it, we must necessarily conclude that she possesses all the means needed for the work given her to do, and that, if that work is not performed by her, it is because she has "hid her lord's money," and become a "wicked and slothful servant." The Church must bear the responsibility. God has, without doubt, furnished a sufficient number of men and an abundance of means to fill all our waste places, and to give the Gospel to all ends of the earth; but we are to blame for not bringing those men into the active service of the Church, and for not advancing those means to educate and support them in the glorious work to which he has called them. We want men and means, not because God has not provided them, but because we do not develop and employ them. We have never yet made a united and strenuous effort to make available the resources which a gracious God has put into our hands. We have wants; but these are the result of our own inaction—of the indifferent use of the means we possess. We want an increase in the number of our ministry; but such an increase can only be secured by the faithful discharge of our duty. It is folly to expect the former without the performance of the latter. Hence, to bring before us the necessity of supplying the ministerial deficiency of our Church, we will, on this occasion, consider *our want and our duty.*

1. *Our want.* To clearly see our want will prepare us to clearly see our duty. It becomes us, in all sincerity and

earnestness, to look at the urgent want of our Church, a want long felt and deeply deplored, a want of more ministers. This is the crying want of our Church in this country. It has been painfully felt since the first colony of Lutherans arrived, in 1637, on the shores of this western world and settled on the banks of the Delaware. And instead of decreasing, it is as great now as ever it has been, and it daily increases. In this respect, our Church in this country is unique. There are reasons for this ministerial want; but whatever those reasons may be, nothing is more certain than that God is not the cause of it—we are responsible for it. It does not, however, fall in with my design to trace, at this time, the causes of our deficiency of ministers, but to demonstrate the existence and extent of that deficiency. The statistical data on which we found our argument, embrace only that portion of our Church in this country connected with the General Synod.*

There are, at this time, in connection with the General Synod, twenty-six district Synods, about eight hundred and twenty-five ministers, sixteen hundred congregations and over three hundred preaching stations, and one hundred and seventy-five thousand communicants. Deducting from this number about fifty ministers, who are engaged as teachers in our

* "There are now (1853) in the United States, according to the estimate of the Professor of one of our Western Seminaries, between 1,400,000 and 1,500,000 Lutherans."—*Dr. Bachman's Luther and the Reformation*, p. 490.

By request, I add for information, an estimate of Lutherans in the world: "Sweden, 3,000,000; Norway, 1,500,000; Denmark, the Faroe Islands, Jutland and Greenland, 2,000,000; France, 500,000; Protestant Germany, 25,000,000; Prussia, 5,000,000; Austria, Hungary, Bohemia and Moravia, 1,500,000; Poland and Russia, 2,500,000; United States, 1,000,000; West India Islands, 100,000; Brazil, 100,000; South American States, 50,000;† New South Wales, 3,014; Nova Scotia, 4,087; Holland, 600,000;‡ England, 40,000; Italy, 500; Turkey in Europe, 15,000.¶—Total 42,912,601." Dr. Eichelberger in his address, says: "The above estimates (to the South American States) are based upon information furnished at my request, by Dr. E. L. Hazelius; and from his intimate and familiar acquaintance with the Lutheran Church, in Europe as well as this country, may be assumed to be correct. This note thus carefully prepared, is added for the information of the Church and those desiring correct knowledge upon the subject."

† Dr. Eichelberger's *Inaugural Address*, 1853.

‡ *Ecclesiastical Year Book*, pp. 23, 99, 128.

¶ Dr. Schlueter's *Popular Theology*, p. 48.

Seminaries, Colleges and Academies, and as Editors of our Church papers, and we have left seven hundred and seventy-five active pastors, who serve, each one, on an average, two congregations and a half, including the preaching stations, and about two hundred and twenty-six communicants. Some of our pastors serve only one congregation, others serve from four to six congregations. We grant that a minister may serve two or three congregations, with a membership of two hundred and twenty-six, though in justice to himself and his people, he ought not to serve more. At present, each pastor in connection with the General Synod serves, on an average, two hundred and twenty-six communicants; and we presume that, on the whole, no set of men are anywhere to be found, who labor harder than our pastors do; they have enough, and more than enough to do, in supplying our regularly organized congregations and present membership. They supply them, however, and so far all is well enough; but other facts must be taken into consideration. It is supposed by good authority, that at present the annual addition to our Churches is not less than fifteen thousand members,* whereas, during the last three years, the annual increase of our ministry, over loss by death and otherwise, has been only between twenty-six and thirty. Now if, according to our present average standard, one pastor can serve only two hundred and twenty-six members, then the thirty ministers whom the Church annually furnishes can, at the same rate, supply only six thousand seven hundred and eighty of the fifteen thousand members annually added to our Churches, and eight thousand two hundred and twenty of them are unsupplied, or, in other words, thirty-seven ministers are annually wanted to supply them. Therefore, to fill up the vacancies occasioned by death and other causes in the ranks of our ministry, and to supply the annual increase of our membership, our Church ought to furnish, every year, *sixty-seven*, instead of *thirty* ministers.

We will now view this subject from another point. In the proceedings of the General Synod of last year, p. 59, it is said: "There are now more than two hundred students at the different institutions connected with the General Synod,

* See last minutes of General Synod, p. 60. *The Missionary* of April 19, 1860, states that "from reliable sources of information, we judge that the number of persons who have been received into full communion of the Lutheran Church, in the United States, during the past three weeks, must not be far from fifteen thousand."

studying with a view to the ministry of our own Church." This, as an aggregate number, sounds well, and is calculated to encourage. But, supposing these two hundred students to pursue, on an average, a six year's course of study, then thirty-three will annually leave the institutions; as we must, however, make some deduction for cases of disability, death and other causes, only about *thirty* of the two hundred will annually enter the ministry of our Church. In this way we obtain the same result we did above. There is an annual deficit of thirty-seven ministers, or, which is the same, eight thousand two hundred and twenty of our members are every year left unsupplied. It may be said that some enter the ministry of our Church, who never studied at our institutions, and are, therefore, not included in the report of the minutes of the General Synod. It is true, some do thus enter; but we are inclined to think that the number of such is so small as not to materially change the results we obtained above.

But to bring the matter closer home, let us look at facts as they exist in our own Synod. We have at this time twenty-five ministers, of whom only twenty-one serve congregations as pastors, eighty-five congregations and twenty-five preaching stations, and eight thousand four hundred communicants. Including the preaching stations, each pastor serves, on an average, five congregations, and if we assign to each pastor two hundred and twenty-six communicants, then the twenty-one pastors supply, on an average, four thousand seven hundred and forty-six members, and three thousand six hundred and fifty-four members are unsupplied, or, in other words, there is in our Synod a deficit of *sixteen* ministers. But in order to supply the three thousand six hundred and fifty-four destitute members with the preached Gospel, each one of our pastors must serve, on an average, four hundred members, that is, he must perform almost double-service. Is it a wonder that our pastors should sink beneath such a double pressure of labor? *Twenty-one* men must do the work of *thirty-seven*, or suffer three thousand six hundred and fifty-four members—nearly one-half of our membership—to go without the preached Gospel. Taking, then, the average standard of the General Synod at two hundred and twenty-six communicants for each pastor, we most clearly want *sixteen* ministers more to adequately supply the wants of the present membership of our Synod. Nor is this all: Some of our charges ought to be divided, and unoccupied fields ought to be brought under cultivation; but having already a deficit of sixteen men,

where shall we get men to supply the new charges when formed, or to occupy the missionary ground within the bound of our Synod?

Besides all this, another fact demands our serious consideration. In 1857 we had sixteen pastors and six thousand three hundred and forty-three communicants in connection with our Synod, which gave each pastor, on an average, three hundred and seventy-three communicants to serve; in 1860, we have twenty-one pastors and eight thousand four hundred communicants, which gives each pastor four hundred communicants to supply. Thus, in the short space of three years, the relative gain of the communicants over that of the ministry, is five hundred and sixty-four members. If we take the average standard of the General Synod at two hundred and twenty-six communicants to each pastor, we ought then to have between two and three additional pastors, to be as well supplied now as we were three years ago.

Once more: As our Synod is *central*, and stands about midway of extremes on all other subjects, we may assume that she stands about midway on the subject of ministerial deficiency. Here are the facts in the case: During the last three years the average annual addition to the Churches of our Synod has been about five hundred and eighty members; now as there are twenty-six Synods in connection with the General Synod, and assuming that the average addition to the Churches of each Synod is five hundred and eighty, then the annual addition to the twenty-six Synods of the General Synod, would be only a fraction over fifteen thousand members, the very estimate given above; and, further, as the five hundred and eighty annual addition of members to the Churches of our Synod leaves us an annual deficit of about two ministers and a half, so the annual addition of fifteen thousand members leaves the twenty-six Synods of the General Synod an annual deficit of about sixty-seven ministers, the very number we lacked above. Thus assumption has become fact. Besides other reasons, our Synod is properly called *central*, as by her, at present, the ministerial deficiency of all the Synods of the General Synod may be gauged.

We have now shown the following facts: We have annually a clear gain of thirty ministers, over loss by death and other causes; but then we have also an annual gain of fifteen thousand members, and as each minister can, on an average, serve only two hundred and twenty-six members, thirty ministers can serve only six thousand seven hundred and eighty

of the fifteen thousand, consequently eight thousand two hundred and twenty of the fifteen thousand are unsupplied, or about *thirty-seven* ministers are annually wanted to supply them. Our data are perfectly reliable; and figures do not lie! Here is the result: To keep pace with the annual increase of our membership, we must have an annual increase of *sixty-seven* instead of *thirty* ministers. These are facts—*stubborn* facts!

But whilst we come short every year, of thirty-seven ministers, in meeting the actual wants of our membership, we have as yet made no provision for the Home and Foreign Missionary fields, nor for the charges that are annually divided and sub-divided, nor for the more than three hundred preaching stations which are gradually growing into congregations and self-sustaining charges. In short, to fully meet all our wants, we ought to send forth every year, not less than *one hundred* ministers. Nor would this number, by any means, exceed the demands we are called upon to supply. For when we consider that the call for more ministers comes from almost every point of our Union—from the larger towns in the West, from the territories, from California and Texas in the South, and British Nova Scotia and Canada in the North, from almost every State, North, South, East and West—and when we consider, further, that our annual addition to the Churches already exceeds, by eight thousand two hundred and twenty members, the present annual numerical ability of our ministry, that the great influx of emigrants is, in a great measure, thrown into the lap of our Church, and to be provided for by us, and that the call for more men at home becomes stronger and louder every year, and the demand for missionaries in foreign lands becomes more urgent, and increases with the increase of stations and converts—in view of all these considerations, who will dare say that an annual increase of one hundred ministers would be too great? But, alas! instead of furnishing annually one hundred ministers, we furnish thirty; and instead of sending men to every corner of our Union and beyond it, we must, for want of men, leave unsupplied eight thousand two hundred and twenty of our members—members for whom ardent tears were shed, and fervent prayers were offered, severe labor was performed and much self-denial was endured—members, bought by blood divine, who gave themselves, under solemn vows, to God, who realized by faith in Jesus Christ, the pardon of their sins, and were made to rejoice in the love of Jesus and the hope

of glory—these members, for want of more men, we cannot supply with the preached Gospel. O, when I think of this, my heart burns within me, and language fails to express my regret! Would God our ministerial want could be supplied this day!

During the last few years, the relative annual increase of our membership has been more than twice that of our ministry. If we were to have, during the next two years, an accession to the ministry of *sixty* men, over loss by death and otherwise, and if not a single member were added to our Church during that time, we would then be scarcely up with the wants of our present membership, on the supposition that each pastor would serve two hundred and twenty-six members. On the contrary, if the addition of members to our Churches during the next two years be thirty thousand, whilst during the same time the accession to our ministry be only *sixty* men over loss by death and other causes, we will then have sixteen thousand four hundred and forty members unsupplied, or seventy-four men will be wanted to supply them, supposing each minister to serve two hundred and twenty-six members.

Everywhere we see large fields open, and rich harvests, ripe for the sickle; everywhere God crowns the labors of our ministry with unparalleled success; and from all sides we hear of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, of revivals and conversions, and of the addition to the Churches of many that shall be saved. But notwithstanding all these "tokens for good," we lack ministers to follow up and supply the great accession of members, and with energy to press the Gospel chariot onward and onward in triumph over sin, in honor of Christ our king. Whilst our increase of members is so encouraging and full of promise, we should expect a correspondingly great increase in the ministry. For as water seeks its level, so, as a general rule, want creates its own supply. Hitherto this has not been the case in our Church in this country. The disproportion between the increase of members and that of ministers, is a striking feature in the history of our Church in America; it is an enigma, the solution of which may not be so easily given. Ordinarily, the increase of the ministry corresponds with the increase of the membership. For every flock a shepherd is appointed. But in our Church in this country, this has not been the case to this time. Where lies the fault? When God pours out his Spirit, revives his Church, and makes bare his holy arm, is

it not reasonable to suppose that he, at the same time, calls to the Gospel ministry an adequate number of men? This we naturally expect. And when he opens an effectual door for the Gospel, is it not highly probable that he gives the Church sufficient means for the accomplishment of the work he has given her to do? There can be no doubt of this. May we not suppose, then, that there are in the Church enough of men and means to fully supply all our ministerial wants, and that all we have to do is to bring out those men into the active service of the Church, and to advance those means to educate and send them forth into the vineyard? We dare not blame God for our want of more ministers; we must evidently blame ourselves. Would that there were in our Church a great revival, influencing men to seek the ministry, and all to do their duty!

2. *Our duty.* Our want implies our duty. God does not send angels from heaven, or raise men from the dead, to preach to our destitute people. With our want, God gives us the means to supply that want. We believe there are men and means enough in our Church to supply our ministerial deficiency. But how may we most successfully bring out and develop the resources the Lord has put into our possession? how shall we make available the inherent treasures of the Church? This is the question that has exercised the mind of us all. No subject is, at this time, of equal importance to us as a Church. The want of more ministers is *our* want, and it is our duty to supply it. No one else can do it for us. Our own people are in want, and if we would not have them stray from our fold, we must come to their aid. Our duty is clear. We are without excuse. It is high time that we awake and bestir ourselves with regard to a matter of so vital interest to our Church and immortal souls.

Have our ministers done their whole duty? To our mind it is evident that our destitution of candidates for the ministry has not been presented from the pulpit as it was our duty to do. We preach on the subject of Missions, on Temperance, on the Bible and Tract cause, and surely all these are important subjects; but what do our people, generally, know about our deficiency of ministers? are they ever made to understand that thousands upon thousands of our own members are destitute of a living ministry, wandering as sheep without a shepherd, and dying without the sympathy and prayers of the Church? On this subject our people must be taught. From the pulpit, at the prayer meeting, in the Sabbath School

and in pastoral visits, it should be dwelt on and pressed home until our whole Church becomes fully conscious of her duty and her mission, and in her anxiety furnish both men and means to preach Jesus Christ to the destitute. It is not enough that we discuss this subject at our synodical conventions, nor that we clearly see and deeply feel the urgent necessity of more men. We will accomplish comparatively little until our people see and feel as we do, until their hearts are touched and made to burn in view of our crying destitution, until they hear the strong voice of God, and the cry of the destitute bid them arise, "shake off dull sloth," and come "to the help of the Lord, to the help of the Lord." There must be a general move in our Church on this subject, a great shaking, a mighty, universal, heaven-sent revival. The angel of God must descend from heaven and trouble the water, before a cure will be effected. It is the duty of our ministry to urge and press home our want, until it agitates, moves, and arouses the whole Church to think, feel and act. A radical reformation on this subject must be effected in our Church in this country. And has the time not fully come when we must commence? We have waited long—too long; much is lost beyond recovery; much is about being lost, but may be recovered by timely and efficient effort. Why wait we then? Does not duty call us to go forward? Let ministers speak to their people in God's name and the name of the destitute, let them speak unceasingly, and lift their voices high and still higher, until the very stones are made to hear and respond to the heavenly call. As ministers, we are too much inclined to think we have done our whole duty, when we have been faithful to the flock committed to our charge; we seem to forget that it is also a part of our duty to seek out proper men to fill our places, to perpetuate the Gospel, and to preach to the destitute in our own land, and to the heathen in other lands. We are fully aware of our want of more ministers, and how is it possible for us to rest—to hold our peace, and to think we have done our whole duty—so long as this want is not supplied? The vast majority of our people have no conception of this urgent want of ministers. It is therefore our duty to inform them. And when they know the facts in the case as we know them, they will doubtless feel on the subject as we do, and act as they ought. Before the Church will take full hold of this matter, and men be won for the ministry, they must be properly informed as to what is wanted, and this information must be given them by our ministers.

Is it not to be feared that we ministers are greatly to be blamed for the destitution we so much deplore? Why is it that our people, generally, do not contribute to the education cause as liberally as they ought? May we not attribute all this to a want of information in our people, rather than to an unwillingness to do their duty? The rock must be smitten before the waters will flow—our people must be thoroughly informed before we can expect them to give as they are able.

To secure more men for the ministry should not be a merely spasmodic effort, which to-day is all life and to-morrow all death; it must, in our Church, become an abiding principle, to always seek to have men equal in number to the work she has to perform; she must, to her very life, feel and fully realize that she is a missionary Church, and that her work is not accomplished until Jesus reigns from shore to shore. As the field of her usefulness enlarges, it is her duty to send forth an increased number of laborers. Her work is great, and she must perform it. In this country our Church was planted by missionary labor; much of her labor is still missionary; and if we mistake not, her future enlargement will be by missionary labor. We are a Church of missions and a missionary Church. Ours was the first Protestant Church to send the Gospel to the heathen in India, and in this country, the first to preach the Gospel to the Indians, and to give them a book in their own language—Luther's Smaller Catechism.* It is our duty and interest—it is the life of our Church—to revive and maintain an active and energetic missionary spirit. Our Education cause is closely connected with the cause of missions. And now that our want of more ministers is so pressing, and the prospect of soon seeing it supplied is so gloomy, is it not a sacred duty to put forth every effort to cause the whole Church to feel called of God to supply this want, to rest not, to sleep not, to cease not to weep, pray and give, till men called of God shall come and crowd beneath the cross, and bear the tidings of Jesus crucified for sinners to all the ends of the earth? Should she not—is it not her duty—to break from her moorings and move forward, sending forth her hundreds of men of God, missionaries of the cross, and thus—

* "Lutherans were the first missionaries of the cross, at least in Pennsylvania, and perhaps the very first work ever translated into the language of the Indians in America, was Luther's Smaller Catechism."—*Clay's Annals*, p. 28.

"Exalt the Lamb of God,
The sin atoning Lamb;
Redemption by his blood
Through all the lands proclaim."

It is our duty as ministers, to urge on men—pious men and men of sound mind—the consideration of the claims of the ministry. Were our ministers throughout the whole Church to call on men, and show them the necessities of the Church, who can tell but many who are now engaged in other avocations, might heed the call, and constrained by the love of Jesus and souls kindling in their hearts, would cry out, "Lord, what wilt thou have us to do?" This subject must be brought to bear on all classes—on young men, the middle-aged, and even the advanced in life—for the feeblest of whom God may have a place which none else can fill. If all our ministers unitedly and perseveringly urge this matter, and do it the justice its importance deserves, the time is not distant when we will have men enough to fully supply our wants. Is it not our sacred duty to do so? God bids us in his name to go forth and call men into the great vineyard. Nathanael did not come to Jesus until Philip called him, and in like manner, many men will not enter the ministry until some one calls them; but when so called, like Nathanael, who was appointed to be an apostle, they may discover themselves to be appointed to the ministry of the Gospel. One minister may be the means of calling another. At present, men are called to the ministry, not by a voice from heaven, but by the ordinary means appointed of God. As sinners are called by the Spirit, in connection with the word of truth, so men are called to the ministry by the same Holy Spirit, in connection with the known wants of the Church. Ministers may be the instruments, in the hands of God, in calling others into the vineyard, as well as calling sinners to Christ. And is it not our duty to do so now? We dare not pass this matter with indifference. Our want is a call from God for more men, and if this want were fully set forth, and brought to bear with all its weight on the minds of men, is it not reasonable to believe that many would hear the still small voice of the Spirit within, saying, Come? Elijah cast his mantle on Elisha, and the latter followed the former.

Whilst our ministers, by preaching and otherwise, fully inform our people of our ministerial destitution, and by every scriptural means urge men to devote themselves to the preach-

ing of the Gospel, it is, at the same time, the duty of the whole Church, of ministers and people, in obedience to the divine injunction, unceasingly and believingly to pray "the Lord of the harvest, that he would send forth laborers into his harvest." The blessed Saviour has here indicated the course the Church must pursue in order to obtain ministers; he commands her to pray him to send forth laborers. It is, therefore, the duty of the Church to engage unitedly, perseveringly and believingly, in prayer to the Lord of the harvest for more men to fill our waste places, and to preach the Gospel to the heathen. Let this prayer be offered in all our Churches, in our prayer meetings, our Sunday Schools, our families—everywhere—and then we may confidently expect that the Lord will hear our petition, and will find men, the right kind of men, and men enough to supply all our wants. It is the Lord's will that we should do so, and it is our duty to obey him in this respect as well as every other. If we would see the Church revived, and sinners converted, we must use the means, ordained of God—we must pray; in like manner, if we would have more ministers, we must use the means prescribed by Jesus Christ—we must pray to Him. If we do so, he will furnish us with the very men we need in number and natural endowments. Is it not to be feared that whilst we so much feel and deplore our ministerial deficiency, we have, as a Church, neglected to use the means prescribed by Jesus, in order to supply that deficiency? We have not prayed as it was our duty, and hence we are in want. Do we not, perhaps, rely too much on human agency, and instead of praying the Lord to raise up men, we take it upon ourselves to raise them up, limiting the wisdom of the Almighty, and confining his call of men within the limit of our own preconceived notions? do we not, perhaps, assume to dictate to God, relying too much on our facilities to give instruction, on our money to support, on our self-sufficiency to supply our want? To all this, Jesus says, "*Pray ye the Lord of the harvest—that he—he would send forth laborers into his harvest.*" We may found as many institutions of learning as we have Churches, and we may have at command as much money as the mint can coin, still, unless we pray the Lord for men, all our institutions and money are in vain. The Lord Jesus will not allow the increase of the ministry to be dependent on institutions and money: they may serve as a means, but no more. He will not delegate to us the prerogative of calling men, but requires his dependent Church to

pray him to exercise that prerogative. Means we must use, but the calling is of God; and when asked in faith, he will give us men and institutions, and money too. O, what can and will not God do for us in answer to our united and believing prayers! We have, for a long time, tried many methods to secure more ministers, and to a greater or less extent, they have all failed. Let us now try the Lord's method, try prayer. This has the sanction of the Great Head of the Church; this will avail, for he has so decreed.

When, in answer to our prayers, the Lord calls men, it is our duty to give those men the means of obtaining the needful mental training. It will not do to send forth ignoramuses into the Lord's vineyard, nor self-conceited upstarts, inflated by what they deem wisdom, but what is really a want of wisdom. Too much of the right things men cannot know; and too little, with all their knowledge, they will always know. The Lord's poor candidates the Church must aid, and the Lord's ignorant candidates the Church must teach. In answer to our prayers, the Lord will furnish the requisite men; to prepare those men for the ministry, the Church must furnish the requisite means. As it is our duty to pray the Lord for laborers, so it is our duty to furnish those laborers with suitable implements. Whilst God must furnish the "smooth stones," David must furnish the bag and sling. As it is not for us to say whom the Lord shall call, it may happen, as it often does, that he will call those who are poor, and cannot obtain the requisite mental training. Such men the Church must not reject, but aid. To pray the Lord for men, and yet reject his poor men, would be mockery. Our contributions must accompany our prayers, and then we will prove ourselves to be in earnest and sincere. The one without the other will not gain the end proposed; but combined, they will ensure abundant success. But, by the constant appeals made to support poor students, the notion begins to prevail that only poor men are called to the ministry. This is a great mistake. God calls men of means to the ministry, as well as the indigent. Men who are able to obtain an education, and possess proper spiritual and natural mental qualifications, are under peculiar obligations to devote themselves to the ministry of the Gospel. They have no excuse. God has given them ten talents. And how can such men escape the displeasure of God, when they are unwilling to employ the talents entrusted to them in the noblest cause? Let such consider what they are doing.

If we would gain our end, there must be union in effort. The whole Church—ministers and people—must unite in their prayers, their benevolence and exertions. United we will succeed; divided we will fall. All the energies of the Church should be concentrated on this point, and with an untiring zeal she should prosecute it until we have ministers enough. We have often struggled to gain this end; but have never made a great, united, persevering and strenuous effort to roll back the want that oppresses us, and to give the Church a ministry adequate in number. God challenges us to try him, and promises to grant our request. It is, therefore, our duty to bring our united prayers, our contributions, and all our efforts into the storehouse of our God, and, lo, he will call more men than we can furnish with Churches. Blessed day for our Church, when that shall come to pass!

Our want is urgent, and it is our duty to seek to supply it without delay. Now is the time to do what we intend doing. We have delayed already much too long. It is high time that we lay hold of this matter in earnest, and with energy and zeal, pressing forward and looking to God for help. The cause is a holy one, and worthy of all our efforts, our money, our prayers and our tears—it is the cause of Jesus. The eternal interests of thousands and tens of thousands of souls are bound up in the issue now pending. Shall we have an adequate supply of ministers, or shall we not? Will we send our destitute people the minister of the Gospel, or will we not? Shall thousands upon thousands of our own brethren in the faith be left destitute, or be forced to seek a home in other Churches, or will we come up to the discharge of our duty, seek out men, educate them and send them to preach Jesus to the destitute? We have a great and glorious work to do, and we must do it now, or in the ease of thousands it will soon be too late forever. The love of Jesus should constrain us to immediate action—action worthy of the cause—action prompted by a high sense of duty to God and souls. What excuses can we frame sufficiently powerful and weighty to avert the displeasure of heaven, if we continue longer to indulge indifference on this subject? Brethren, we have no excuse. God brings before us our duty so clearly and powerfully, so closely and touchingly, that we must be blind if we do not see it, seared if we do not feel it, and deaf if we do not hear his voice. The call for more men is borne to our ears on the wings of the wind; it is wafted aloft from all parts of our Church, and heard before the throne of God

louder than the seven thunders. The blessed Son of God makes his last command ring continually in our ears: "Go, preach the Gospel to every creature." Can we turn a deaf ear to the heavenly voice? can we slumber amid such stirring calls? Can we with indifference think of our ten thousand destitute brethren, and not be moved? Or will we, with relentless indifference, turn away and suffer them, unpitied, to pine and die? Do the tears of Joseph not move us to pity, to action, to prayer and strong supplication to God for men to preach tidings of great joy to the destitute? Let us, with full confidence in the divine promises, put our hands to the work, and, God helping us, we shall soon see the dawn of a bright and glorious day, a day that shall make glad the city of our God.

Finally, as ours is the Central Synod, let us by our example, start an influence that shall extend to the circumference. Great movements, to produce a great effect, must always start at the centre. The heart, though small as compared with the body, is the head-spring of life, and at every stroke sends the quickening fluid through innumerable channels, to the utmost extremity of the body. By the help of God, let us not be remiss in our duty on this subject. We have a charge to keep. At the organization of this Synod, on the 20th of February, 1855, the following resolution was adopted by a rising vote: "*Resolved*, That in the name of the great Head of the Church, the Lord Jesus Christ, and in reliance on his grace, and with the view of promoting his honor and glory, and in order the more fully to develop the piety and liberality of our Churches, we now organize a new Synod." To fully "develop the piety and liberality of our Churches" was the glorious design of the founders of our Synod. It is our sacred duty to maintain this design inviolate, and to carry it out to its fullest extent. Let us by our practice actualize the high purpose that gave utterance to those words. They should be the watchword of our Synod. And now that our liberality is to be tested—now that we are called upon to promote the honor and glory of Jesus Christ by our means—and now that our Churches may demonstrate their piety and liberality, let us this night send up a contribution that shall evidence our attachment to the great principle avowed by the founders of this Synod. Some of those who then gave a rising vote, have gone to glory, and but a few of them are here to-night. Though they have passed away, the principle they expressed will not pass away. The cause they

sought to promote, and which we advocate, is the cause of Jesus, and must ultimately succeed. Let us then take courage, and give as though we had never given, and should never be able to give. To this the Lord Jesus invites you, the want of ten thousand souls invites you, the Church on earth and in heaven invites you. O can you still refuse? Come, each and all, and let us lay our gift at the feet of Jesus, and when we die we will not regret it. God add his blessing! Amen.

ARTICLE IV.

THE PRAYER MEETING.

WE propose to consider the PRAYER MEETING: its *Scripturalness*, its *benefits*, and the *way to make it most efficient*.

I. *The Scripturalness of the Prayer Meeting.*

By this we mean that it is sanctioned both by the letter and the spirit of the Gospel.

By the *prayer meeting*, will be readily understood, the social meeting of the members of the Church, for religious worship, chiefly prayer and praise, in which the services are performed mainly by the members of the Church, and not, as in the more formal service of the public sanctuary, by the pastor, or appointed minister. Such meetings may be *stated*, forming part of the regular weekly worship and enjoyment of the means of grace; or *special*, appointed on particular occasions, and for special purposes. It is principally of the *stated weekly prayer meeting* of the Church or congregation, that our remarks will be made.

In saying that the prayer meeting is sanctioned by the *letter* of the Gospel, we do not mean to affirm that there is any passage of Scripture prescribing such a meeting in precise terms. There are no specific directions given in the New Testament, as to the frequency with which Christians should meet for worship, as to the time, place, or mode of conducting their public worship. We have directions for the sanctification of the Sabbath; for the preaching of the Gospel; for the administering of the Sacraments; but not as to the exact *method* even of these. We have, however, in the book

of Acts, and the Epistles, a history of the practice of the apostles and the primitive Church, with inspired statements of their views, throwing sufficient light upon these points; while the history of the Church immediately subsequent to Apostolic days, may serve as a commentary on the scriptural statements, and aid in their right interpretation.

It would seem evident that the meetings of the Church were not confined to public assemblages on the Sabbath, in which the apostles, or other ordained ministers preached, and administered the ordinances: but that also, on the Sabbath, and at other times, there were meetings at which the brethren of the Church, the laity, as they were subsequently called, to distinguish them from the ordained ministers or clergy—a distinction not scriptural, and originally made in a bad spirit, but afterwards adopted as a matter of convenience—took part, leading the prayers of the assembly, and speaking words of exhortation.

It would be very difficult to show that the promise, “Where two or three are gathered together in my name” (Matt. 28 : 20), was made solely, or specially, to the immediate disciples, the chosen twelve in attendance on Jesus. Even the words just preceding it: “Again I say unto you, that if two of you shall agree on earth as touching anything that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father in heaven.” Even these words, which some would restrict to the twelve, the inspired apostles, John in his epistle seems to warrant us in applying to the Church at large. (See 1 John 3 : 22, v. 14, 15). And so we claim the promise as the heritage of the whole Church; and as sanctioning the meeting of Christians for social prayer, and throwing around such meetings an inexpressible interest. And if Christians would only think more of this, and oftener meet together in Christ’s name, two or three, or more—for the small number but speaks the greater interest of a larger number—what precious seasons they might enjoy! What precious seasons his people thus meeting have had!

“How sweet and awful is the place,
With Christ within the doors!”

In Acts 12, we are introduced directly to one of the special prayer meetings of the early Church. Peter was imprisoned by Herod. The members of the Church at Jerusalem, finding no help in an arm of flesh, but having confidence in God,

resorted to prayer, and continued in it. "Prayer was made without ceasing of the Church unto God for him." (verse 5) Observe, it is said, prayer was made "of (or by) the Church;" and in the 12th verse we are told that when Peter was released, he came to the house of Mary, the mother of Mark, "*where many were gathered together, praying.*" It seems to have been just like one of our modern prayer meetings. And it appears too, as if it were a thing to which these Christians, these members of the Church at Jerusalem, were already accustomed; as if immediately, on connecting themselves with the Church, they formed the habit of meeting for prayer, each taking part in prayer and mutual exhortation, according to his ability.—(See 1 Cor. 12.)

The directions given by the apostle Paul, Heb. 10: 24, 25, lead us to the same conclusion: "Let us consider one another to provoke unto love and to good works: not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is, but exhorting one another; and so much the more, as ye see the day approaching." There would seem to be here an injunction that they should frequently meet together for religious worship and mutual exhortation.

The Scriptures nowhere teach that all public and social worship is to be conducted only by ordained ministers or elders. Any one who will carefully and impartially study them, will find sufficient warrant for the holding of meetings in which the laity take active part. A fair interpretation of 1 Cor. 12, fully warrants this; as does the 15th chapter of the same epistle.

We have said that the distinction of clergy and laity is not scriptural, however convenient it may have become. The Scriptures do, indeed, recognize the offices of Pastors, of teaching and ruling elders, and deacons; and thus an official distinction between them and other members of the Church. But the leading scriptural idea is, that we are equal members of one body. The Church is one great priesthood; every member entitled to approach God, and all encouraged as God gives them ability and opportunity to serve him, by helping each other. The apostle Peter strongly sets this forth (1, 2: 9): "Ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people; that ye should show forth the praises of Him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light:" language which he addresses to the whole brotherhood of Christians.

There have been times when the prevailing sentiment has been that all worship, all religious service, was to be conducted solely by ministers regularly ordained for this purpose; times when they who sat in the Apostles' seat, kept the keys of knowledge and of grace, and doled these out to ignorant and superstitious men, as they saw fit. There are portions of the Church in which, even now, to a great extent, this prevails. Even outside of the Romish Communion, there are many who strenuously maintain a wide distinction between clergy and laity, exalting the clergy into a privileged class, to be regarded as the almoners of the divine bounty, exclusive channels of God's grace; and forbidding the assembling of laymen for public social prayer and exhortation, as unauthorized and unholy. And there are thousands who think they can receive the word of life only from "ordained" lips, and regard it as wrong for laymen to offer prayer or teach in public. Still, all down the history of the Church there have been these prayer meetings. In the darkest ages godly ones have met together, and encouraged one another's faith. And as successive reformations have thrown off the incumbrances of superstition, and taught a true Christian freedom, the Reformed Churches have felt the power and preciousness of such meetings, and have encouraged them. Until now, with the large body of Protestant Churches, a weekly prayer meeting has become a part of its ordinary life, only second in importance to the Sabbath services. And so evidently has the Lord sanctioned such meetings, so clearly has Christ been present in them, so manifest have been the good results flowing from them, that those accustomed to them scarcely need to inquire, whether they are sanctioned by the Scriptures, and do not trouble themselves to reply to those who say that only ministers may pray in public. More might be said, if it were needful, to show the *scripturalness* of the prayer meeting. But this is enough. Clearly, it is not merely an offshoot of puritan revolt from prelacy, or of radical independency; but an outgrowth of Christian life—one of the ways in which it was designed by the Great Head of the Church, that the Christian life should manifest itself.

We will now consider

II. *Some of the Benefits of the Prayer Meeting.*

1. And first: *It serves to break in upon the round of earthly cares, and to prevent that absorption in worldly things to which we are all exposed.*

That we are thus liable to have our hearts drawn away from God, and occupied by the cares of this life, every one knows. By the very necessities of the case, we are drawn into the world, and the seeds of the kingdom, implanted in our hearts, must struggle in their growth, with the tares which the world sows. Of course, it is not wrong to be engaged in secular pursuits. The necessary business of the world is not sinful. We may worship God at our work. We may be pleasing him as much in our daily toil as in the prayer meeting, and may be receiving into our souls as large measures of his grace. In the very occupation to which our position in life calls us, we may do the highest work for God's honor, by quitting ourselves like men; and thus may the joints and sinews of our spiritual constitution be knit and compacted in vigor. But all the while, the spirit of the world, which is antagonistic to God, *may* be insinuating itself into our souls. And the longer we are uninterruptedly in contact with it, the greater is our danger of being injured by it, of having its hooks of steel fastening us to its service ; of having our spiritual fervor deadened, and our consistency of Christian living impaired. Hence the desirableness of interrupting this contact with the world, this devotion to business, to domestic cares, to pleasure ; of having our souls brought directly into the atmosphere of sacred things ; brought to the direct contemplation of the great truths that are for our salvation ; brought into communion with God. We need to turn aside from the fatiguing paths of our journey, from the heat and burden of the world, to rest beneath the shade of the tree of life, and drink of the fountain that flows there clear and full. The daily private prayer ; the daily bowing around the family altar ; these are helps and guards of unspeakable value, essential to our highest good. He that neglects these, whatever he may substitute for them, sins against his own soul. But in addition to these, it is good to have something of a more formal and public character ; something that shall come at stated times, as the voice of the Church, and through the Church the voice of God, to summon us away to the place of prayer, hallowed by many precious associations ; "Where friend holds fellowship with friend ;" where God manifests the riches of his grace ; and the soul is often illumined as from the very Shekinah, with a radiance that diffuses through it gladness and strength. It is good thus to have an hour marked off as holy time, when the world is made to stand back, and the soul has its privilege of feasting

with the Lord. In the country of the Moslem, when the Muezzin sounds the hour of prayer, and the name of "Allah" is proclaimed from the sacred dome, all drop their work, and bow the knee and offer up their worship to the great Prophet and to God. Set aside the superstition and gross error, and let their example teach us a lesson. Let us say to the world, be still; begone for the moment; let this sacred hour alone. We gather strength from these precious seasons. They serve to nourish our faith, and love, and every grace. They serve to keep our armor bright, to enable us to stand in our lot, and to fight manfully the good fight. They serve to subdue the world for us; to aid us in keeping it in subjection; and to make even its cares and temptations helps in our spiritual advancement. Experience proves all this. They who are most regular and devout in attendance on the prayer meeting, other things being equal—for of course this cannot compensate for the neglect of other duties, though it will tend to prevent such neglect—will, *in general*, have largest measures of Christian joy, and activity, and intelligent acquaintance with the Gospel, and glad usefulness. We do not say that mere attendance at the prayer meetings will produce these effects; or that joy and activity of piety are exclusively the privilege of those who attend them; or that God will not, in some way, compensate those who *cannot* attend these meetings, for the loss they sustain. But we do say that such is the tendency of the prayer meeting, and such the testimony of experiences as to its influence in saving the Christian from undue worldliness.

But it may be said: The Sabbath was appointed for that purpose; that is God's ordinance; and ought we not to be satisfied with the one day in seven, which He has fixed as the appropriate measure of time to satisfy our religious wants? We answer, it would be very unfair to infer that because God has *required* one day in seven to be set apart to honor Him for our own profiting, therefore we may not find great gain in voluntarily appropriating other portions of time, taking it out of that which He has given us for the work of life, at once a free will offering to Him, and an appropriation for our own soul's good. Is there any danger of our displeasing God by offering Him too much service, provided we neglect no duty; or by feeling too sensibly both our indebtedness to Him, and our weakness and need of help; or by coming too often to His throne of grace with prayer and praise? Did He mean that our social religious worship was to be confined

to the Sabbath, when we have the opportunity and find it good to meet oftener? The prayer which our Lord Jesus taught his disciples, was a prayer for every day. And is it to be offered only in private, or in the family? May we not meet to pray it very often? The apostles and early Christians met often, perhaps every day, for worship. They who advocate a daily service in the Church, have some plausible argument in support of their views. The blessings that have attended the daily union prayer meetings, so marked a feature in the religious history of the past two years, furnish no unimportant confirmation of them.

Again, it may be said: Does not the weekly lecture, conducted by the minister, answer all the demands of the case better than a prayer meeting? That presents some *thoughts* to occupy and inform the mind, and in it we may expect the services to be conducted to edification, at least without any unpleasant improprieties. We answer, we regard these weekly lectures as holding a very important place as means of grace. They do have the effect of breaking in upon the world, and giving food to the soul that might be hungering and starving amid the husks of worldliness. But they cannot take the place of the prayer meeting; while they contribute to its interest and efficiency. So convinced are we of this, that, where it is impossible to have both prayer meeting and lecture, and the people have preaching regularly on the Sabbath, we would endeavor to combine the advantages of the two in one service, making the lecture short, and calling on brethren to offer prayers. Or we would occasionally vary the service, setting aside the lecture altogether, and making the meeting wholly one of prayer and conference. The reasons for this view, and the reply to the objection just stated, will more fully appear as we proceed to consider some other benefits of the prayer meeting.

2. *It creates and strengthens sympathy among the members of the Church.*

The prayer meeting holds to the larger congregational meeting on the Sabbath, the relation of a social friendly gathering to the mere formal public assemblage, or the ordinary meetings of business and public life. We meet as a band of friends, of brothers and sisters. Ordinarily the great majority of those who attend such meetings, are members of the Church; and those, who are not, come, for the most part, because they have a certain degree of interest in religion, find a pleasure in the services, or are impelled by a desire,

or a hope, vague and indistinct it may be, of good to be derived from them. We thus get near to each other. There is a common feeling pervading the assembly. The Christian tie that unites us is recognized. Sympathy is awakened. We feel an interest in each other, and feel that others are interested in us. It is often noticed that there is a freedom and friendliness of greeting, even among those comparatively strangers to each other, which is not observed on the Sabbath. The remark is often made, that the social prayer meeting is the place where Christians become acquainted with each other. Persons, moving into the congregation from abroad, and feeling a sense of loneliness as strangers, have had this greatly relieved, and much gladness poured into their hearts, by coming freely to the prayer meeting. Then there is something in the greater freedom and familiarity of the services, that tends to nourish the same feelings. The prayers are directly from their own number. The people tell their own desires and sorrows; and heart joins heart in a common experience. And several prayers, being offered by several different individuals, again deepens this feeling; each speaking in his own way to God, and each in some way touching the heart, and keeping the interest and emotion fresh. And this speaking from experience, suggesting to the mind practical illustrations of Scripture, accompanied by an occasional judicious remark of a devout Christian, will afford ample theme, of thought, to be a basis for reflection, and for sound emotion. Thought will be bathed in emotion, and will fill the soul with fresh and glad impulses.

Now this *sympathy* of which we have been speaking, is no unimportant matter in its bearing, both on Christian comfort, and Christian growth. We are not only cheered, we are also helped by sympathy; by having our hearts drawn out towards others, and knowing that they are drawn towards us. There is a power which our philosophy has not yet measured, in what may even be called a physical sympathy—the excitement of feeling, from the mere presence of numbers assembled for a common purpose, listening to the same tone, and the utterance of the same emotions—a power which God uses for the conversion, and for the comforting and strengthening of his people. We all feel it. It is one of the prominent elements in the large union prayer meetings. It is one of the forces employed in wide-spread, general revivals of religion. It is utterly impossible always to distinguish between it and the direct working of the Holy Spirit: or to deter-

mine when it is a mere animal or intellectual force, uncontrolled by the higher power, and when it is such an agent controlled and used by the Spirit for his own wise and gracious purposes. It may be mistaken for the Spirit's working, while it is simply natural, having in it no element of piety, no touch of grace. But without doubt, it is a power designed of God for most important ends in the economy of grace. Christianity, while so truly individual and personal—the life of God in the soul of man—is also eminently social. Human nature is social. The cry of the soul is for companionship and love. Every heart—you may utter it absolutely—*every* heart has a chord that vibrates at the touch of sympathy. Christianity uses this as one of its great saving forces, sanctifies it, clothes it with eternal life. We are now brothers, fellow-members of Christ. Heaven will only be a higher and holier social life. No solitary soul to mourn for want of sympathy there. No monkery, no convents, no hermit cells. We cannot believe that this social feeling, this craving for affection, is in such a sense physical, that it dies with our bodies. But at all events, while we are yet in the body, reaching forth into that higher life, God uses this as one of his means of grace towards us. He opens it as one of the fountains by the way, at which we may drink and be refreshed. And the prayer meeting is to be prized because through this invisible power, here so much called into action, it cheers the Christian pilgrim, gives reality to his hopes, and intensity to his faith, and makes him glad with companionship by the way. So Christian and Faithful are brought together, and the strong arm of the one defends the other, and they walk arm in arm through Vanity Fair, and the enchanted ground; and they climb together the Delectable Hills, and see the gloriously beautiful city of their destination, and bid each other be of good heart, as they go down into the river of Death.

3. *The prayer meeting serves to develop the power of the members of the Church.*

It is the meeting of the Church, and the services are conducted by the laymen in distinction from ministers, or laymen and ministers meet together and unite in conducting them. The time has been, as before intimated, when the lay element of the Church was made of small account; when the clergy assumed and exercised all power; and the people were content to leave it in their hands, and gave themselves little or no concern about it. But all that is now changed. It is

no longer believed that "there such divinity doth hedge" ordained ministers, as to make them the depositaries of all grace, the only authorized dispensers of religious knowledge, or actors in religious services. Nor can the members of the Church any longer believe that the sole responsibility of managing the affairs of the Church rests on the ministers. Indeed, this never has been the theory of the Protestant Churches, though to too great an extent, it has practically prevailed at some times, and in some portions of them; and in all, perhaps, the energy of the members of the Church has been too largely undeveloped. In the modern era of revivals, and missions, and benevolent institutions, much has been done to draw out into active use, the powers of the people, and obviously with immense benefit to the progress of the Gospel. Especially is this true of the Church in this land, where the nature of our civil institutions, and our social customs, favor the utmost freedom of speech and action. And the new features of the religious working of the last two or three years, have given still more prominence to the lay element, and served greatly to develop its power. Every one knows how the revival of religion has been carried forward by the activities of laymen; especially in sustaining union prayer meetings, in distributing tracts and other religious books, in securing public preaching of the Gospel to large masses, in teaching Sunday Schools among the destitute, in personal efforts to secure the conversion of sinners. Any one, at all conversant with the operations of our large benevolent institutions, our large ecclesiastical bodies, and our various organizations for Christian philanthropy, must know how much influence our laymen exert on them. And within the last two or three years, much energy hitherto undeveloped, has been called into active exercise, and the thought has taken hold, strongly and practically, of the mind of the Church, that every Church member must work for Christ. At the same time, we cannot perceive that the power of the ministry has been at all weakened, or the respect entertained for them and their office at all diminished. Through all they have been, and still are, regarded as *leaders* of "the Sacramental host." They have developed and guided the talents, the power of the laity. Their faithful, instructive, earnest preaching, has been the ground force and support, under God, of the great movement of the Church. And perhaps this day, while the Church has come up to a higher sense of personal responsibility, and consciousness of power, and fuller putting forth

of strength, the ministry has a stronger hold on the sound respect and earnest affection of the people, and is exerting a wider influence for good. But not to dwell too long on this thought, it is to our purpose to say that the prayer meeting does much to favor this development of the energies of the laity. In it men learn how to pray, and how to speak for Christ, and for their dying fellow-men. Men who might have lived on for years, correct in their Christian deportment and useful, but with their spiritual influence comparatively small, have been encouraged and trained by the prayer meeting, into most useful Church members. Men of stammering tongues at first, have learned to speak, to encourage their brethren, and to warn their impenitent fellow-sinners, and persuade them to flee to Jesus. And by their interest awakened and deepened in the prayer meeting, they have been incited and encouraged to go out and labor in the way of visiting, or of personal conversation with friends; or they have taken a larger interest and more active part in the general affairs of the Church. Action deepens interest, and prepares the way for action.

A man may, indeed, be fluent in prayer and exhortation in the prayer meeting, and yet not be consistent in Christian living and working. Every good thing may be abused. Energy may be developed in a bad direction. Still, the prayer meeting, rightly used, is adapted to develop Christian ability for good. Daily observation shows this. We all know how the prayer meeting has been *the very making* of some useful Christians among us.

4. Closely connected with this is the thought, that *the prayer meeting is adapted to make the members of the Church feel their responsibility.*

A sense of responsibility, unpleasant as it may at times be, is one of the best kinds of discipline of character. It summons us to action in the discharge of duty: and thus strengthens our moral principle and force, keeping our moral condition healthful. Now there are some responsibilities which we may forget, unless we are often brought face to face with them. It may be very pleasant to sit in the sanctuary or the lecture room, and enjoy the religious services, for which the pastor alone is responsible, resting easy in the thought that the praying and the preaching devolve on him. But when you come into the prayer meeting, your sense of responsibility is aroused: you feel that you, too, have some

public social duties to perform—a work given you to do. And this sense of responsibility does not limit itself simply to the feeling that you ought to lead in prayer, or say a word when you have a word to say. It extends to all the Christian life. It makes you feel that you are to be a witness for God; a worker for Him according to your ability in the place which He has assigned you.

We do not say absolutely, that it is the duty of every brother in the Church to lead in prayer, or speak in the prayer meeting. Certainly there are exceptions to what should be regarded as the general rule in this respect. All should be ready to do their part according to their ability, and to have a good reason for holding themselves excused from these duties. But obviously the prayer meeting rightly conducted, is adapted to make those who attend it, feel that they ought to be living, active members of the body of Christ.

5. *Add now the fact that prayer meetings have secured God's blessing on the Church.*

Every promise to answer prayer, especially *united* prayer, is an encouragement to the prayer meeting. In proof that such prayer has been answered, we may point to the case of Peter (Acts 12), already alluded to; to Paul's frequent testimony that the prayers of the Church on his behalf were answered: e. g. 2 Cor. 1: 10, 11. God "delivered us from so great a death, and doth deliver: in whom we trust that he will yet deliver us: ye also helping together by prayer for us, that for the gift bestowed upon us by the means of many persons, thanks may be given by many on our behalf." We remind our readers of the important place which such prayer meetings have had in all great revivals of religion, and what they have done to sustain the Church in times of coldness, or of persecution, or of bereavement. We remind you of God's answers to united prayer, so numerous and so marked, in recent times. We remind you of what must be familiar to your own observation, that a deep interest in the prayer meeting is always accompanied by a larger interest in the Church and congregation; so that the saying, "The prayer meeting is the spiritual thermometer of the congregation," has come to be one of the proverbs of the Church. When the prayer meeting is well attended, and the people are fervent in supplication for God's blessing on the minister in the preaching of the word, and on all the means of grace, the preaching is more evidently in demonstration of the Spirit and of power, the heavenly unction is felt by the congrega-

tion, and the word of God is glorified. Every earnest minister knows this, and feels the value of faithful praying circles. Our readers are perhaps familiar with the story of the aged pastor, one of whose parishioners took it upon himself to complain to him somewhat of the dullness of the Sabbath services. "Ah," said the good minister, "Ah! my brother, I have lost my prayer book!" and then, to the parishioner's astonished gaze he explained, that he and other members of the Church neglected the prayer meeting, and so the blessing of God failed to rest upon them. You are all familiar, too, with the Scriptural narrative about Aaron and Hur holding up Moses' hands.

These are some of the *benefits* of the prayer meeting which should make us feel that we cannot let it go, or afford to lose its advantages. There is much, very much, to endear it to us. Thousands gratefully remember it as the means of leading them to the Saviour. Thousands have found in it strength and comfort in their Christian life. They can say—

"It is sweet to mingle where
Christians meet for social prayer:
It is sweet with them to raise
Songs of holy joy and praise."
"I have been there, and still would go.
'Tis like a little heaven below."

We know very well the complaints that are sometimes made about such meetings. The meetings are sometimes dull, and there is a liability to injudicious and unedifying remarks and prayers. Still, these are occasional and slight defects, easily overlooked or borne with by a Christian spirit; and they who are in the habit of attending such meetings, and who come to them in the name of Christ, testify that they find it good to be there. Their souls have been greatly refreshed and strengthened; and they thank God for the privilege, and feel that their brethren and sisters who cannot be with them, suffer loss.

We recollect well, the interest with which we read, years ago, the story of an eccentric but excellent minister of New England, who was wont, in his own peculiar, and sometimes homely way, to describe the scenes in Jesus' life, by which he would instruct and amuse his people. At one time "he had noticed a falling off in his little circle that met for social prayer; and he took occasion the first time he had collected a tolerable audience, to tell them concerning 'the

conference meeting' that the disciples attended after the resurrection. 'But Thomas was not with them.' 'Thomas not with them!' said the old man in a sorrowful voice. 'Why! what could Thomas be away for? Perhaps,' said he, glancing at some of his backward auditors, 'Thomas had got cold-hearted, and was afraid they would ask him to make the first prayer: or perhaps,' said he, looking at some of the farmers, 'Thomas was afraid the roads were bad; or perhaps,' he added after a pause, 'Thomas had got proud, and thought he could not come in his old clothes.' Thus he went on, significantly summing the common excuses of his people. And then, with great simplicity and emotion, he added: '*But only think what Thomas lost! Jesus came and stood among them! How sorry Thomas must have been!*'"

Yes! it is Christ's presence makes the meeting good and precious; and how much they lose who do not come and find him there!

"Have you been to the prayer meeting?" said one to an aged Christian mother. "Oh yes," she said, "and a delightful meeting we had." "And who were there?" "Jesus and myself," said she, with sweet simplicity of faith and reverential joy, "and it was a happy meeting."

We proceed now to offer some suggestions on

III. The way to make the Prayer Meeting most efficient.

The real efficiency of the prayer meeting, that which consists in the actual accomplishment of good results, depends on the Holy Spirit. He only can make it truly a means of grace to the soul. From him it has all its spiritual power and influence.

But so far as human agency is concerned, its efficiency depends on *the spirit in which it is regarded*, and *the manner in which it is conducted*. And these, again, reciprocally affect each other. Like every ordinance of the Gospel, and every other means of grace, the efficacy does not lie alone in the thing itself, but in it, in connection with the spirit and manner in which it is used. The mere external application of water in baptism, or the mere eating of bread and drinking of wine in the Lord's Supper, does not convey a spiritual blessing. There may be a looking on the crucified Saviour, as he is seen in the Gospel, a listening to the preaching of the sacred truth, without any enlisting of the heart's affections in Christ himself. Prayer may be offered, and be utterly powerless, without the heart's emotions and a living

faith in the promises of God. The prayer meeting, adapted as it is, to do so much good, will not do good unless it is rightly used. Men may come to it, and go away unblessed; because they do not come with a proper spirit; or because it is not properly conducted. All of us know that we find the prayer meeting more pleasant and profitable at some times than at others; and the reason is, that we are in a better condition, physical and spiritual, to enjoy it; or that all the circumstances in the management of the meeting, combine to make it interesting. The praying, the singing, the Scripture read, the remarks made, all are in just the right spirit, well selected, pertinent, pervaded by rich thought and feeling. Complaint is not unfrequently made of the manner in which the meeting is conducted. It is cold and dull; the prayers are too few, or too many, or they are too long and lifeless; the remarks are injudicious, or they are heavy and tedious; some persons pray or speak, who are not qualified to speak or pray unto edification; and things are said and done which offend the taste or the judgment of the complainant. It is easy to find fault; for some persons extremely easy to be dissatisfied, or to think that if they had the management of things, all would be much better. Undoubtedly there are, at times, just grounds for all the complaints alluded to. But then let us all consider how far we ourselves are responsible for them. The *dullness* of the prayer meeting, for instance; how far may this be owing to the fact that you, and your brother here, and your sister there, have come to the meeting dull and unspiritual, without any definite expectations, or sense of personal responsibility, without any earnest desire to find Christ, and without asking God's blessing on the meeting, and his guidance and direction in it. You know that although the man without the wedding garment gained admittance to the feast, he had no enjoyment there, because he was not suitably prepared, because he had wilfully neglected his duty. The interest of the meeting does not depend simply on those who take an open part in it, but also on all who attend. Here comes in the power of *sympathy*. When the hearts of the assembly, or of the majority of them, are pervaded by a lively Christian feeling, those who pray and speak will feel its influence, and life and power will be imparted to the services. And then, even if there should be some improprieties of speech, if the prayers should be too long, and some things should be omitted which ought to have been remembered, how easily can a heart filled with love to Jesus

and his cause, overlook these defects, and select the good and feed on that ! How easily can one who feels that, according to his promise, Jesus is present with him, forget any little infelicities in the exercises of his fellow-sinners ! If our hearts are occupied in communing with our Lord, we shall be comparatively little affected by things apart from him. In the majority of instances, perhaps, the reason why the prayer meeting has not proved interesting or profitable to any of us—though it may have been profitable when it has not seemed interesting—is, that we have gone to it without suitable preparation. The fault lies more with ourselves than with our brethren.

Let us consider then, as the first step towards securing the highest efficiency of the prayer meeting,

(I.) *The importance of a suitable preparation for it.*

And this preparation may be regarded as *general* and as *specific*.

In the *general* preparation we may mention,

1. *A due sense of responsibility with regard to it.*

We have admitted that there is no passage of Scripture actually prescribing our attendance on the prayer meeting. We do not claim that it is a divine ordinance. Still, we do claim for it, on the ground of its scripturalness, and its benefits, the support of the members of the Church. And out of our relation to each other as Church members, out of our Church covenant arises a certain obligation to attend it. We are bound to be helpers of each other, and to strive together for the furtherance of the Gospel, in all ways that commend themselves to our judgment, and our conscience. The Church may fairly expect its members to give their support to the regularly established meetings for worship and mutual edification. It is well known how much the interest of these meetings is affected by the numbers who attend them. The very coming together of a large body of the members of the Church, itself awakens interest. In every congregation, there must undoubtedly be many who, for various reasons, are unable to attend the weekly prayer meetings; and many others who can attend only occasionally: while it is perhaps impossible for all to attend *all* such meetings that are sustained in a large congregation. But when these allowances are fully made, is it not true that the great majority of Church members may, by a systematic arrangement of their

business and domestic cares, secure time and opportunity to attend with tolerable punctuality and regularity, at least the ordinary weekly social prayer meeting of the Church. We all know how much depends on system and habit in such matters. Let us take it as a thing of course, that we are to attend the prayer meeting, and we shall find other things giving way to this, and ourselves regularly in our place, without any sacrifice of duty, and with only the exceptions to which all are unavoidably liable. It will be well for young Christians particularly to observe this, and begin their Christian life with such a course.

But our responsibility does not end with our personal attendance. We should feel also that we are, in one measure, responsible for the character of the meeting. There should be in all who attend, a willingness to do what they can to add to the interest and profit of the meeting. If they cannot speak, or lead in prayer, they can pray silently to God to help those who do speak or audibly pray, and to fill all hearts with his Spirit. They can seek of Him, for themselves and others, that preparation of heart which He alone can give; and endeavor to be interested worshippers, interested participants in all the services. Certainly it cannot be required, as an absolute duty, of all the brethren of the Church, without exception, that they should offer prayer in the public or social meeting. Very obviously, all are not equally gifted in this respect. There are some persons for whom it seems to be an impossibility that they should pray or speak in such meetings. There are physical or constitutional difficulties, which seem to be insuperable. But, as a general rule, every one should, on his connection with the Church, desire, and make the effort to bear a part in this work. Some may never attain to it. But there are others who, if they would but make the effort, would be surprised and delighted to discover the ability they are now leaving unexercised, and would derive great enjoyment to themselves, and contribute greatly to the good of others. It is very desirable that our young men should cultivate judiciously the power which God has given them, and begin in the prayer meeting a course of training that may make them greatly useful.

2. *The habitual entertainment of right views of the prayer meeting, will prepare us to enjoy it, and receive benefit from it.*

If we set a right value on it as a means of grace, from which we are to receive good to our souls, and as a power to

bless the Church, God having appointed to hear united prayer, we shall come to it with expectations and purposes from which good will be realized. If, for instance, we look upon it as a place where brothers and sisters in the Lord meet to manifest their sympathy for each other, we shall find our souls comforted there. If we habitually rely on Christ's promise, and join his name to meet him among his disciples, we shall find it good to be there. In one sense it may be said that we each carry the life of the prayer meeting in our own souls, and if that life be faint, the meeting will be cheerless. If we come not in Christ's name, we cannot expect his promise to be fulfilled. If we expect the prayer meeting to do us good without our souls being awake and active in it, we shall be disappointed. God may send blessings even to listless, careless souls, in answer to the prayers of others who are glowing with love. But that is a special act of his grace. We have no guaranty that the meeting will bless us, if we do not try to meet our own responsibility with regard to it.

3. But in addition to these, the best *general* preparation for the prayer meeting is a *life of earnest piety*—daily communion with God, and engagedness in his service.

He who, like Enoch, habitually walks with God, will be most ready to find God present in the meeting for social prayer; and will bring with him a state of heart best fitted for its enjoyment. And not for its enjoyment only, but also for contributing to the interest and profiting of those who are present with him there. The prayers of such a man will be pervaded with a heavenly unction, and his words of exhortation will be weighty with prudence, and fall with the gentle but mighty power of love. His experience and practice of piety will both furnish him facts to state, and principles to defend, and inspire those who hear, with confidence in him. They will listen to him as to one who knows what he says, and is sincere. Men will take knowledge of him that he has been with Jesus; and when he rises to pray, or to speak, their hearts will be glad. The well known principle that it is *character* that gives weight to a man's utterance of moral truths, has a specific application here. The Christian who is known to be consistent, whose character, as exhibited in his daily life, bears the test of examination by the Gospel standard, is always heard with respectful and interested attention in the prayer meeting, even though he be not fluent of speech. While the man whose piety is doubted, against whose character there are charges of gross inconsistency,

though he be "gifted" in the language of prayer, eloquent and learned, fails to win respect or to exert a deep and salutary and productive influence. Goodness, unfeigned experimental piety, best qualifies one to enjoy these meetings himself, and to contribute to their efficiency. Moreover, the prayers of such Christians are the prayers which God answers with blessings on the Church, with blessings on the means of grace, with the conversion of sinners; and not the prayers of the inconsistent and insincere or formal professors.

Besides this general preparation, there should be a specific preparation, as far as possible, for each meeting.

1. This may consist in *thoughtfulness as to the nature of the exercise in which we are about to engage.*

We ought never to rush into the presence of God in acts of worship, hastily and thoughtlessly. God, it is true, is ever near us; and it is our privilege to call upon him at all times, out of the thickest of the fight with sin, from amid the confusion of the world. And it may be that the unavoidable cares of the world will accompany us, and harass our minds, even to the very door of the house of prayer. And it may be that it shall be just one of the richest blessings of the prayer meeting, that there a sweet calm may settle on the soul, stilling the waves tossed into tumult by the tempests of the world. Still, it becomes us to come always thoughtfully to the house of worship, having a due reverence for him whom we hope to meet, and a due regard to the solemnity of the services in which we are to engage. "The Lord is in his holy temple, let all the earth keep silence before him." "Let us have grace whereby we may serve him acceptably with reverence and godly fear." "Keep thy foot when thou goest to the house of God, and be more ready to hear than to give the sacrifice of fools; for they consider not that they do evil. Be not rash with thy mouth, and let not thine heart be hasty to utter anything before God, for God is in heaven and thou upon earth, therefore let thy words be few."

And not only should there be the thoughtfulness that will secure reverence, but also that which will form reasonable expectations of benefits to be derived from the meeting, and reasonable views of our personal responsibility with regard to it: a thoughtfulness as to the object for which we come, the good that is sought, and the means of obtaining it. We shall thus be saved from coming and going listlessly, and from let-

ting the meeting, so far at least as we are concerned, degenerate into a mere formal and profitless routine. We shall be much more likely to have a spirit of prayer and a word of counsel. Though not with the supernatural endowments that were bestowed on the early Church, yet when we come together we shall have every one a Psalm, a doctrine, a tongue, a revelation, an interpretation. We shall pray with the spirit and with the understanding also; and we shall sing with the spirit and with the understanding also; and all things will be done unto edifying (1 Cor. 14).

2. And we should come to the prayer meeting, *having first lifted up our hearts in prayer to the God of all grace*, that he will bestow his favor upon us, and pour out a spirit of grace and of supplication on the assembly; that he will cause all things to be done decently and in order, to the edification of all present, and to the glory of his name. Remembering that "the preparation of the heart and the answer of the tongue are from the Lord," we should ask these of him for ourselves and our fellow-christians. Our endeavor should be to make careful and special prayer for such a blessing on the prayer meeting. We shall always find ourselves profited by it. But when we have not time for this, let us at least offer a brief petition from the depths of our souls—"Give ear, O Shepherd of Israel. Thou that leadest Joseph like a flock: thou that dwellest between the Cherubim shine forth." "God be merciful unto us, and bless us, and cause his face to shine upon us."

These suggestions, we feel sure, must commend themselves as truthful, to the experience of many at least of our readers. Simple and familiar as they are, they involve important principles. If we give due heed to them in our practice, we shall find them contributing largely to the interest and efficiency of the social prayer meeting.

We proceed now to offer—

II. *A few hints as to the best mode of conducting these meetings.*

1. *The Conductor of the meeting should take pains to prepare himself for it.*

Of course, there must be one to preside over the meeting, else all things will not be done decently and in order: there will be confusion. This presiding brother should be previously appointed. It should not be left to the time of assem-

bling, and to mere chance, to put one in the chair. He may be either the pastor of the Church, or one of the elders, or any other brother selected for the purpose, and notified of his duty. Ordinarily, in the regular prayer meetings of our Churches which the pastor attends, unless there is an understood arrangement otherwise, the pastor will be expected to preside. When he is not present, the care of such meetings is understood to devolve on the elders of the Church, who by an arrangement among themselves, conduct them in rotation. The more limited and specific meetings adopt their own method of proceeding, with regard to a leader. The essential point is, that there be some order pursued—so that the individual who is to lead, may beforehand be aware of the fact, and prepare himself for it. It is desirable that, as far as practicable, this duty be distributed among the Church members; so that as many as possible may have the opportunity of experience in this respect. This course has been pursued with good results in those meetings which are less strictly the Church prayer meetings—such as the young men's and boys' meetings, which, while being of great benefit in themselves, furnish admirable schools of training for the more general meetings: and also in the large union prayer meetings, where all denominations meet together, and the lay element is brought into prominence. This will be the case too, in those praying circles which consist exclusively of females. The custom of our Churches—and we believe it is Scriptural—discountenances the praying or speaking of females in mixed assemblies for worship, but favors their exclusive social meetings for prayer and mutual exhortation.

But whoever conducts the meeting, ought to make *previous preparation* for it. He ought, at least, to select the portion of Scripture which he will read, and the hymns which shall be sung; and if practicable, fix upon some train of thought to be suggested to the meeting. It is easy to perceive that the good results of this will be the securing of pertinency in the remarks that may be made, and a correspondence between the hymns and the Scripture, and some degree of unity in the exercises. It will also tend to save time; to avoid the unpleasant delay which sometimes occurs while the passage of Scripture must be looked for, and the hymns selected, and the mind, coming to the work without previous thought, wavers and hesitates in making the selection. We have all felt, at times, the infelicities of such long delays, while the audience were waiting in impatient silence;

as well as the infelicity of a bad selection made in haste. Let it be added that to select, and read over beforehand the Scripture and the hymns, will contribute greatly to the effectiveness of the reading of them, and to the avoiding of mistakes and stumbling, which sometimes occur when one is called to read that with which he is not just at the moment familiar.* This will apply, too, to the remarks made. A little previous reflection will secure greater freedom and pertinency and *brevity* in these.

We do not say that these things should never be done strictly extemporaneously. The Lord sometimes calls us unexpectedly, suddenly, into his work, or puts us in such circumstances that we have no time to think beforehand what we shall do or say. And then grace is given us according to our need; and our extemporaneous effort, being, in fact, the outgrowth of experience, or of indirect preparation, may be most successful. But neither in the pulpit, nor in the chair of the prayer meeting, should the leader of the services presume to meet his responsibilities purposely and carelessly unprepared. It is due to the sacredness and importance of the services; it is due to the people present; it is due to God; that he should not unwarrantably presume on his native ability, and the stimulus of the occasion.

We are not advocating studied, elaborate addresses and prayers. We are simply insisting that, as far as is practicable, the leader of the meeting should think in due time of what he is going to read and say.

2. It is desirable that there should be variety in the exercises.

And to this end, it is better to have a number of brief, specific prayers and addresses, than to have a few individuals occupy the time with lengthened prayers and general remarks. Long prayers and long addresses, however appropriate they may be at other times and places, are not the things for the social familiar prayer meeting. They tend to produce dullness. They become wearisome, and instead of nourishing a devotional frame of mind, they often stifle emotion, and prevent the expansion and delight of the soul. "He prayed me into a good frame, and then he prayed me out," said Wesley of one who indulged in long prayers. Long prayers are apt

* We would suggest that it is not necessary always to read the whole of the hymn that is to be sung, especially if it be a familiar one. The mere announcement of it, or the reading of a few lines, will often be the better way.

to indulge in repetitions, and to be cold and formal. And the assembly, instead of having their hearts go out in fervor with him who prays, are in danger of becoming merely impatient listeners, wishing that he would cease.

So too, it is desirable, in order to avoid sameness, to distribute the services as fully as possible among the brethren who attend; not to have the same individuals taking part in them on every occasion; but to have a kind of rotation and division of the service, so that all may have an opportunity to enjoy the benefit of such efforts, and to do good to their brethren. When the number in habitual attendance is small, this variety cannot well be secured; nor is it, by any means, indispensable to the interest and profitableness of the meeting. There are brethren whose voices we can often hear in prayer and exhortation, with great gladness and comfort. Still, for the sake of the general good, the effort should be made to secure variety; to have as many as possible in turn bear their part.

3. Effort should be made by those who lead in these services, to have the prayers and addresses *specific* and *pertinent*.

It is well sometimes to have specific subjects previously announced, so that the minds of all may be directed towards them, and each may come with his own views of them, and prepared either for prayer or remark, as the case may be. Thus, for instance, it may be published from the pulpit or otherwise, that the next prayer meeting will be devoted to the case of the children of the Church; or to prayer for a blessing on Home Missions; or to "anxious" persons, or to the impenitent, &c.; or at the commencement of the meeting, the leader may make some such suggestion. Or if that is not done, the members of the Church may each have some specific thing in mind, and make that a subject of prayer if opportunity afforded. There is no subject proper to be mentioned to God at all in the hearing of men, that may not appropriately form the theme of prayer at the social meeting. But we do not wish here the general and all comprehensive prayers of the sanctuary, so much as we do more specific petitions for special objects. When an individual rises to pray, he ought to have something to pray for; and it is far better to offer a few brief, pointed petitions directly for some blessing distinctly in view, than to make a long prayer for every thing. We all feel at once, how much more force and life are secured by such pointed and earnest requests for a distinct specific thing: how much more readily our hearts join in

them; how for such things there is really much more actual united prayer. And this is just on the well known principle that he works better who aims at a mark, than he who strikes at random; that the mind and the heart both act with greater vivacity and force, when there is something plain and definite before them. The lens concentrates the sun's rays on a given spot, until the heat produces combustion, where the merely diffused radiance would have had no such effect.

And even should it happen that several persons should, in succession, pray for the same thing, yet each presenting it in his own way, out of the deep feeling of the heart, we do not lose the freshness of interest in it. While, on the other hand, the failure to observe this, is likely to make the prayer monotonous and tedious. The individual will fall into stereotyped forms or sets of phrases, offering the same prayer on all occasions, so that when he rises, those present know at once what he is going to say; or he will often seem like one feeling after something which he is not able to reach; praying all around, because he has no distinct object before his mind. There are times when the heart overflows with feeling and thought, and prayer insensibly lengthens itself:—when, as it were, the hearts of all the congregation are poured into the heart of the speaker, and flow forth in one deep stream of thanksgiving and praise, or of supplication and intercession; and no one thinks of being weary. These, however, are rare occasions, and they always justify themselves.

The same remarks will apply to addresses. *Brevity, pertinence, and variety,* are objects to be constantly kept in view. The modern method of conducting our union business men's prayer meetings, has reduced this matter to a system; which, while it may sometimes seem to savor too much of a secular arrangement, making a business matter of religion, has yet taught us important lessons. The limiting of prayers and addresses to a certain number of minutes, has undoubtedly served to give greater animation and effect to those meetings, and has had a happy effect on the habit of those who take part in them.

Almost any one must have observed that during a time of awakened religious interest, there is much more specifeness, earnestness, and brevity in these social exercises. Men then seem to have something to pray for, or something to say; and they pray or speak directly to the point, and stop when they have done. And as the revival seems to be passing away,

prayers grow longer and more formal. This shows that what is greatly needed to make the prayer meeting what it should be, is a heart full of love to God, having in view some specific object to be gained.

It is not necessary, perhaps not desirable, that there should be much speaking at our ordinary prayer meetings. A mistake is often made in this direction, and too much time is occupied with speaking, or people are dissatisfied if some addresses are not made. They may be most profitable and interesting meetings, even when the whole time is spent in prayer and singing, and not a word of remark is made; and it is well sometimes to have them so. Still, they are designed for conference as well as prayer. And the remarks made should be of a character to throw light on the Scripture, or on some point on Christian experience, or some difficulty of the sinner. The formal sermon is not suitable for the prayer meeting. Facts drawn from experience, a word or two of sympathy or encouragement—these, and such as these, such things as Christians would speak of in their social intercourse, or in their conversation with impenitent men—are the themes best adapted to promote the interest and efficiency of the meeting. It is a social and familiar meeting. Men may tell each other what God has done for their souls. The recital of facts, illustrating the power of godliness, the preciousness of faith, answers to prayer; the unfolding of experience; the incidents of practical Christianity, which do not readily find their way into the more elaborate utterances of the pulpit—these are the things to give vivacity, interest, force to the prayer meeting. True, it is always well to have some subject of thought before the mind, to awaken its energies; as all sound emotion must be sustained by some intellectual activity. But it is *illustration* of truth rather than *discussion* of truth, that is to accomplish this. We all know how much of the interest and power of the Fulton Street, and Jaynes' Hall, and other Union Meetings, is derived from these sources. Facts are detailed, men speak of things that have occurred, things that they know, that they feel. Individuals make known their wants, or declare what God is doing for their souls. They are places where God's Providence and Grace are living realities, passing before our eyes in visible forms; and where men feel at home to speak freely about their souls. Not the theory alone, but the practical working of Christianity, is brought to view. A saved sinner praising God for his salvation, touches the heart, and an awakened sinner

seeking salvation, is encouraged to ask for the prayers of God's people, and heartfelt prayer is offered.

While the interests of the Church at large are always fit theme, for the social prayer-meeting, there is peculiarly the place for regarding our own interests: the interests of the congregation or parish to which we belong. The members of a particular Church may talk of what is of special interest among themselves. Cases of anxiety, of conversion, of affliction, of sickness, may be mentioned: calls for benevolent action, opportunities for doing good, facts in the Church at large bearing specifically on the particular Church, may be stated. Then we are drawn into closer fellowship with one another. Then we pray for a special blessing on the means of grace among us. Then we remember with a warm sympathy our own brethren who are sick, or dying, bereaved, or in trouble of any kind. Then we are drawn to pray for our children, for the young, for the anxious and inquiring, for the beginner in Christian life, and for the irreligious and unawakened. Sometimes one and sometimes another of these classes will occupy our thoughts. Sometimes we shall come mainly as seekers of comfort and sympathy, of light and guidance, for ourselves; and sometimes our hearts will be all aglow with desires for others. We should give to these Church prayer-meetings, a home, or family character, and so make them sources of comfort and strength to us all. This is one of their great advantages, that they are social, friendly assemblies, where we come together to speak to one another, to ask and to receive each other's sympathy; to meet Jesus and his brethren as the disciples of old used to meet, and to be refreshed by the familiar communion.

The question arises: Shall these meetings be made free, and the exercises be left to the voluntary action of those present?

With regard to this, we think, no definite rule can be established. Some order must be pursued, and the control of the meeting must be in the hands of the individual who presides. It depends very much on habit which system shall be pursued. The voluntary system, though always liable to abuse, has the advantage of securing freedom to all, and thus, greater variety and vivacity. Probably in the majority of the weekly prayer-meetings of our established Churches, it is customary for the leader to call on individuals by name to offer prayer, and to make remarks, and perhaps this plan, will, on the whole, secure a greater amount of intelligent

and edifying services. Still, the advantages of the voluntary system ought not to be lost, and the two may be combined. As already intimated, it is always desirable to avoid long pauses, intervals of inaction and waiting. The meeting is always more interesting when there is promptness in occupying the allotted time.

Let it be understood that it is a *social* prayer meeting, and that all should feel at home, and be free, and assured of the sympathy of all. Formality, stiffness, is always to be avoided. A word or two from a brother who has a thought to utter, a brief prayer for something in point—there is always liberty for these, and they will be acceptable. But all must respect the rights and feelings of others; and never use the prayer meeting as an opportunity for uttering censure or complaint, the outpouring of wounded pride, or censorious self-righteousness.

We may add, that punctuality in commencing and closing the services at the appointed time, is carefully to be observed, as conducing to their efficiency. Do not delay commencing because there is not a large attendance, do not prolong the meeting beyond the proper time, because of special interest manifested.

Thus have we endeavored to set forth the scripturalness of the social prayer meeting, its benefits, and some of the means by which it may be made most efficient. In conclusion, we may be permitted to sum up what we have suggested, in a few sentences of direct address to our readers.

Set then, a high value on the prayer meeting as a means of grace; as breaking in upon the round of earthly cares, and preventing that absorption in worldly things to which we are all so much exposed; as creating and strengthening sympathy among the members of the Church; as developing their power, and adapted to make them feel their responsibility, and as securing richly God's blessing. Make it a rule to attend the prayer meeting as regularly as you can, being urged thereto by a sense of obligation to your fellow-christians, as well as by a desire to realize its benefits. Come with the love of God and a spirit of prayer in your hearts. Come in the name of Jesus, expecting to find him there. And do what in you lies to secure that the services be properly conducted, and that the prayers be *brief, specific, pertinent and fervent*. Remember that the state of your heart will have much to do with the character of the meeting, whether you

utter your voice or not. Come with such a spirit, and you will find it good to be there. All meetings will not be alike interesting and profitable, but you may find good in all. Come not to see who is there, or to criticise what is done; but come to find Jesus, and to seek a blessing for yourselves and for your brethren. With such a spirit, you may readily overlook any improprieties of speech, any infelicities that may occur. The prevalence of such a spirit among those who attend will readily repress anything like vanity, and love of display; like forwardness and love of eminence; like harshness and censoriousness, should any unhappily be tempted to err in these respects.

ARTICLE V.

BACCALAUREATE ADDRESS.

No. XIII.

Delivered to the Graduating Class, September, 1847, consisting of Messrs. L. E. Albert, John A. Bradshaw, M. M. Bachtell, F. W. Brauns, A. Essick, D. J. Eyler, Jacob H. Heck, E. G. Fahnestock, R. A. Fink, H. Jacobs, M. W. Merryman, W. H. Morris, J. K. Plitt, M. Posey, Peter Raby, P. Sheeder, W. H. Witherow.

ACTS 11: 24.

THE relation between teacher and pupil may be regarded as interesting in the very highest degree. Although there may appear sometimes a want of respect and attachment on the one side or the other, this should not be the case, and can be explained only as the result of wrong views or wrong actions. The man whose vocation is the instruction of the young, should feel for them a solicitude such as characterizes the parental heart, and to the very utmost of his ability endeavor to render them useful and happy. He ought to labor as for beloved children, that the end of their being may be accomplished, and that in time and eternity they may be blessed. The pupil, on the other hand, should regard his teacher, not as the restrainer of his liberty, not as the hard master, who imposes unreasonable and heavy burdens, but as the guardian selected by parental affection, who toils for his

good, and aims, by all the means known to him, to render him everything that he ought to be to secure the approbation of the good, and not fail of the commendation of God. When this relation ceases, it should not be forgotten, through life should those who have occupied it, be mindful of each other's weal, and both in wishes and efforts contribute to each other's good. It is with these views and feelings, young gentlemen, that we are prepared to inform you on our part, that the separation which is now about to take place between you and your teachers, will not extinguish their respect and affection for you, release them from the desire that you may, in all the future, be models of every excellence, and instruments of good to your country and your race. It cannot be our privilege often to furnish to you counsel, and express to you our good will—the season for this is past. The few moments which yet remain must not be neglected, and they will be used in an attempt to describe the good man—than which a higher eulogium cannot be pronounced upon human nature; than which we cannot desire anything better for you, if, under the influence of the intensest affection, we poured forth our wishes for your highest good. The phrase good man, is often used and applied with little discrimination, to a great variety of characters. Although it is true that the really good man may present himself with various peculiarities, there are fundamental properties which must be identical in every human being to whom these terms are applicable. It is not uncommon to call him a good man who, correct in his dealings with his fellow-men, honest and truthful, and observant of the courtesies of life, discharges reputably, according to the world's standard, the duties of life. It is not to be denied, that among the men of our world, there are many whose deportment distinguished by no elevated Christian principle, nevertheless bear their faculties so meekly, and so demean themselves in their intercourse with their kind, as to deserve and receive high commendation, and, compared with other and less favorable exhibitions of humanity, may merit a laudatory appellation; but falling below the highest standard of excellence; or deficient in higher traits of our nature, they fall short, too, of the claim to the highest commendations which can be conferred on man; fall short, as the good man represents that commendation, of it. In determining the characteristics of a good man, we should never be able to satisfy ourselves in regard to those which are unequivocal, unless we could learn from some unerring standard what they are; so various

are the opinions of men, so largely and loosely do they apply such epithets to their fellow-men. Could we receive the estimate of that Great Being who made man, and who knows in what his highest excellency consists, then, and only then, can we feel secure that our footing was good. God has, through the medium of the Bible, made us acquainted with the destiny of man, and shown us how his nature attains its highest ornaments. With this book to guide us, mistake is not easy, and if we regard as good him whom the Maker of men determines to be so, we cannot err. Respecting then, this authority, we pronounce as essential to the good man, a heart imbued with the spirit of Christianity. As Christian is the highest style of man, so no man can be called good, who is not a disciple of Jesus, in the fullest sense of the term; not merely a speculative believer in the truth of Christianity, not merely an admirer of its wonderful disclosures and of its beautiful poetry and its instructive history, but more than all this, the depository of its grace, glowing with the affections which it calls forth, and animated by the spirit which it enjoins, and which it illustrated in the life, the memorable life, of its great Author. Whatever elements mingle in the constitution of a good man, have their foundation in the spirit of Christianity dwelling in the human heart. The same mind must be in us which was in Christ. Believing in Christ, and trusting in him for acceptance with God, our walk must be characterized by the imitation of God, and love must appear in all that we do. This then, without further debate, we will regard as the first point, and to every one whose purpose determines him to rank with the good, it can be said, here is the primary step, your powers of body and soul must be consecrated to God your Saviour, Him you must love, Him must you serve.

The good man selects for himself some definite mode of concentrating his energies for the accomplishment of good. The pursuits of life are diversified; labor, intellectual and physical, is divided, both on account of the limited powers of man and the greater good which may thus be effected. As one man cannot act in different capacities, as he cannot exercise the different professions or mechanic arts, he must make his election and select from the mass that to which he believes he can profitably apply himself, and which he may consider congenial to his taste and his endowments. No step in life can be considered more important than this, and it is not unfrequently the case that the mind is perplexed in forming a conclusion. The advice of others sometimes may be impos-

tant, but frequently it will be difficult to obtain it, because it is difficult to give it. Selecting no mode of ministering to our own wants, or exerting an influence upon others which is disreputable, because inconsistent with Christian purity, and having regard rather to the good of others than our own individual advantage; seeking the guidance of the highest wisdom, both human and divine, we cannot err, but will find ourselves placed in spheres of action which will be adapted to our capacity, and suited to the purposes of good which we have in view. It is not consistent with the highest goodness in human nature, that we should not prepare ourselves for action, such as will be beneficial, and fit ourselves to take part in the operations of life. No situation in which a man can be placed, no independence which he can attain, should, in his judgment, exempt him from the obligation of preparing himself to be useful to others. Now we may be preachers of the Gospel, we may be physicians, we may be lawyers, we may be instructors of youth, we may be merchants, we may be mechanics, it matters not, let us be something by which we can contribute a part to the grand and necessary movements of the world. If our Creator designed us for an active life, and that he did, our constitution, both mental and physical, and all the arrangements of the world around us, divinely appointed, prove, and action can only be efficient in the highest degree when under the guidance of wisdom, and concentrated upon a narrow limit, then it will be apparent that some one or other pursuit of life must be adopted by us.

In speaking of a preparation for action, of professions and trades, it is important to observe that in the good man there should be a judicious admixture of contemplation and action. The educated man naturally regards it as his duty to use his cultivated mind in the acquisition of knowledge. Knowledge is pleasant to the soul. The ability to acquire it with ease, and the pleasures attendant upon its acquisition, will render study delightful. A good man should be studious. Truth should be sought by him with great diligence in the oracles of God, in the oracles of nature, in the history of the world, in the occurrences of every day. It is treachery to our highest interests to neglect this. It ought to be regarded as a leading aim of a good education, to give the mind an impulse in the pursuit of truth. Never should it be thought that the limited attainments of the College course will suffice. They are but the foundation. Subsequent and diligent labor is to rear the building. On the other hand, it is not for a moment

to be thought, that the pleasures of acquisition are alone to be enjoyed; that study, that contemplation will fulfil our duty. This is not the law of our being, this is not the will of God. Should we always be learning and never communicating, constantly receiving and never supplying, it would be no better than accumulating money and never using it; it would be a great and criminal failure in our stewardship, which has respect not merely to physical, but likewise to intellectual treasure. A judicious combination then, of contemplation and action, of study and communication, ought to be regarded by us as a proper aim, and happy is he, and perfective is it of his moral excellency, who so studies as not to neglect action, and so acts as not to neglect study.

The good man not only prepares himself for exerting an influence upon others, and combines, that he may be duly qualified, contemplation with his active efforts, but his actions have a definite purpose, and that purpose is the happiness of others. In order to accomplish this, he is not neglectful of the amenities of life, but cultivates true politeness. His politeness is different from that of the world, which, with all its glitter, often conceals the most heartless selfishness. It does not consist in honeyed words and elegant postures, in smiles and bows, and nameless nothings, but springing from true benevolence, it aims to produce comfort, and to supply wants, and seeking not its own, but exercising true self-denial, it relinquishes its ease that it may promote that of others. It has sometimes been our lot to witness gross deviations from all the laws of true courtesy, on the part of those who have made high pretensions to it, and to know that the most decided marks of deference and respect could be connected with the most perfect indifference to wants, when the supply of them demanded a little forgetfulness of self. Such is not the urbanity of a good heart or of a good man. Whatever currency it may have in the world, and whatever elegance there may be in some of its manifestations, however much it may add to the glittering panoramas of a deceitful world, it, in a moral estimate, is utterly worthless, it is miserably defective in any feature truly attractive, and should never be named in any connection which would tend to exalt it to an equality with that other, that genuine politeness, which studies to do good in the minor offices of life, which carefully abstains from all injurious acts, and which aims to render comfortable those who are under your influence, whether they be high or low, at a tavern, or a watering place, in a stage

coach, or in the town where you make your abode. We claim for the good man true politeness, we exhibit him as a model of it, and though he may fail in some of the artificial conventions of society, and raise a laugh at occasional ignorance in persons whose greater ignorance and hypocritical histrionism would excite very different emotions, he is, nevertheless, truly the gentleman, and truly the polite man, because he is benevolent, and because he aims constantly to contribute to the comfort of others. Not only this, which may be regarded as a minor sphere of action (but by no means unimportant), but likewise in all the interests of men, he seeks to do them good. Convined that to the true dignity and highest happiness of man, education is necessary, and having experienced its advantages in his own case, he is the friend of it wherever he may be, and endeavors, both by exciting men to obtain or to confer it, and by aiding the indigent in acquiring it, to place them in the way of ministering to their own bliss, and likewise of exciting a benign influence upon their fellow-men.

It is said of him whose character, as portrayed by the pencil of inspiration, furnishes the guide of our meditations on the present occasion, "And much people was added unto the Lord." There was an intimate connection between that character and the effect mentioned. His influence would not, could not have been salutary, in any degree, in that particular direction, had it not been pervaded by Christian charity. It was the love of Christ which, exercising its constraining influence upon him, and the love of souls which, giving direction to his actions and inspiring his words, formed such a consummation as the history describes. To do good in this way is the highest achievement of human intellect and human power. It may not be the most admired and lauded by men, we know it is both by a more just tribunal. The warrior who has fought the battles of his country, and conducted its armies to victory, may shine more upon the pages of history, baptized with a demoniac spirit, but in the records of heaven they shall shine with brighter lustre, who save souls from death, and turn many to righteousness. These are true, though bloodless victories: no enemy is destroyed but the enemy of God and man; no wives are deprived of their husbands; no parents of their children; no children of their parents; no desolation is carried into the habitations of men; but the broken heart is bound up, the wounded spirit healed; joy is substituted for sorrow, there is glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace. These are the conquests at

which the good man should aim, these are the conquests which he effects, on which he can look with no feeling of remorse, and which every good being in the universe, from the lowest up to the throne of God himself, must admire. Let no one think that this is the vocation of the ministry of reconciliation; it is its peculiar vocation, but it is the vocation of the scholar and the Christian, and as every man has facilities of contributing, so every man is bound to be employed in this service. We can consider no man entitled to the appellation of good, who does not feel that this is one of the prominent ends to be effected by his instrumentality.

The good man loves his country, and seeks its highest happiness. Patriotism is characteristic of the man whose goodness is modeled upon the standard of Christianity. How can it be otherwise, than that the intelligent and virtuous should love the land of their birth, the home of those whom they know best, and from whom they have received most. If that country should be blessed with free institutions, if it should guarantee in the highest degree, the inalienable rights of man, if it should be favored with the best religion, and be swayed by it above most others, if it should furnish the means of life, liberty and happiness in a pre-eminent degree, how unnatural would it be, not to feel for it a high reverence, and to be devoted to it with a strong love! To love it as we ought, it should be our care that in none of its legitimate functions it interfere either with the rights or happiness of its own citizens, or those of other countries. Carefully should we guard it against every exercise of oppressive power, or interference with the rights of any human being. Its beautiful constitution should be studied by us in its elements, and in those varied developments which have occurred since its adoption. Well should we understand how intelligence and high Christian integrity sustain and apply it. Ready should we be to aid in its administration, if our fellow-citizens deem it to be our duty, and no conflict with higher duties be involved. Actively should our influence be exerted upon our fellow-men, and at the polls to secure the elevation of men to the various offices of the country, fitted by their education and by their religious habits, to understand and to employ the instrument placed in their hands by the founders of our government, for the good of their constituency. It is a Christian duty, obligatory upon every good man, in a country like ours, to exercise the elective franchise, but to do it wisely, virtuously, not blinded by party zeal, nor for the purpose

of promoting some unworthy end. No men ought to be better qualified, no men are better qualified than Christian men for the exercise of this high office of free citizens.

The good man loves his race, and aims to advance its highest happiness. His good will is not restricted to home, to his native land. There are millions of human beings, with a rational nature like his own, the creatures of the same Creator to whom he owes his being, the ransomed of the same blood which purchased his spiritual freedom. That high injunction of the faith which he has adopted as the guide of his life, which indicates to him the duty of contributing to the happiness of the whole family of man, excites him to have respect to their wants, and to minister to them. Fain would he be instrumental, either directly or indirectly, in conveying to them the blessings of civilization, science, law, all that holy religion whose tendency is so favorable to the most perfect civilization, and the most profound science. Sometimes he feels it to be his duty, by personal efforts, to ameliorate the condition of his kind. Sometimes he can satisfy his conscience with contributions of his substance, for the purpose of advancing the happiness of men, through the agency of others. In whatever way he may act, his object is one, that object is the elevation of his race, the diffusion of the glory of God, the advancement of the interests of the kingdom of Christ. The picture is imperfect, very imperfect, but such as it is, we give unto you, to guide you in determining the elements of true goodness, and to show unto you what should be your aim. Such men have existed. In this wicked world there have been many such. Since Christianity arose a light upon our world, its divinity has been confirmed by many illustrious instances of men made holy by it. Many such yet live, the ornaments of their race, the blessing of the world. We will cherish the hope precious to us, that you will swell the number, and gain a reputation such as is theirs.

That you, young gentlemen, should be good men, may not need any very specific proof, additional to what has already been intimated; but lest you should think that that which has general claims is presented with special application, we will briefly endeavor to show how pressing are the considerations which urge *you*, rather than others, to be found in no other ranks than those of the good; engaged in no other service than that of fitting yourselves for higher stations in nobler climes, by Christian action for yourselves and others.

It certainly may be regarded as due to the advantages you have enjoyed, that you should be good men. Having passed through a course of education, largely imbued with the Christian element, and having been placed in circumstances for a series of years, eminently favorable to a proper estimate of the superiority of such a character, and having had materials of conviction the most abundant, that the dignity and happiness of man are essentially associated with genuine goodness, it becomes not only your duty, but pre-eminently so, to aim at the possession and exhibition of true moral excellence. In the dispensations of Divine mercy, it has been your lot to receive munificently, and the responsibility which you have thus incurred, the debt of gratitude imposed upon you, summon you to efforts proportionably great in the display of high religious culture. Above all men in the world, does it become the man who has received a Christian education, to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with his God; to think of those things that are true, honest, just, pure, lovely, and of good report; to bring forth the fruits of the Spirit, which are love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance. Deeper infamy and more terrible retribution must be the portion of those who, so highly favored, and from whom so much more is expected than from others, fail to render it, and even come short of an equality with them. With whatever feeling of joy or exultation our finished labors in this stadium of our existence may be mingled, with whatever complacency we may look on the past and hope on the future, it should never be forgotten that we have virtually given a pledge to the universe of moral good, which unredeemed, will leave us to the loathing of our own hearts, the scorn of the upright, and the terrible condemnation of that mighty Being in whose hands is the disposition of our final and eternal destiny.

It is due to the wishes of those who feel the deepest interest in your welfare. Your parents, your teachers, those to whom you are most dear, who have toiled most for your good, who can never cease to feel anxious for your welfare, if asked what, above everything else they desired for you, it would no doubt be that you might in the journey of life, now opening before you, take your place among the friends of God, rendering unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, unto God the things that are his. Such desires from such a source, can be regarded by you with no other feelings than those of the highest respect, and were they directed to what is not best,

they may claim from us a most decent rejection ; but when commanding themselves by internal characteristics determining their excellence, and fortified by the sanction of Divine knowledge, they cannot but be regarded by us as presenting motives the most cogent that can reach the volitions of man. Urged then by intense longings of these disinterested friends, the beings in this world who will follow with unspeakable interest your future career, who will rejoice when you rejoice, and weep when you weep, who can never be coldly indifferent to anything that concerns you, let your walk be that of the man of faith ; quit yourselves like men. So live that your life may be a blessing ; so live that death may be gain ; so live that your memory, when you have left the earthly house of this tabernacle, and occupy the building of God, the house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens, may be precious and endure long. In no other way can you attain the most perfect blessedness, either here or hereafter. Vice and misery, religion and happiness, are, by the appointment of God, inseparably connected. As well might we expect to gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles, as to obtain happiness from impure desires, unholy passions, and criminal actions. If we do not aspire to be the instruments of our own misery, the destroyers of our peace, the murderers of our own souls, we must live the life of the good man. Self love then, permitted to employ its advocacy and urge its claim, beseeches us to listen to no voice that proposes to us good as the result of the neglect of duty, or offers to us a blissful immortality on any other conditions than those of strenuous exertions in the oft-rugged path of obedience to the precepts of God. The best interests of our fellow-men link themselves with our own, to urge us to be men trained in the school of Jesus of Nazareth. Armed with tremendous power by that education which you have received, you go forth into the circles of humanity prepared to exert a great influence. You may, if such should be your choice, mark your pathway with moral desolation and death. It will be easy for you, aided by the corruption which is about you, to contaminate with the worst pestilence, the unwary and the young. You may aid the great adversary of God and man in defeating the purposes of divine mercy, and destroying human souls. You may attain the terrible distinction of having prepared human beings for earthly shame and sorrow, eternal misery and disgrace. In virtuous abhorrence of such issues, you may ask, Are thy servants dogs, that they should do such things ? All

that we can say is, God forbid that you should do them ; but as we know that one sinner destroyeth much good, so do we know that we cannot be passive ; if good emanate not from us, evil will ; if we are not a blessing we will be a curse, if our deeds are not registered with approbation in heaven, they will be in hell, and if in eternity ransomed souls rise not up to call us blessed, in hell damned spirits will rush madly around, to proclaim us the authors of their eternal damnation. Looking with compassion upon our own immortal spirits, looking with compassion on the immortal spirits of others ; set for the destruction or the salvation of both, convinced that all depends on our own character as bad or good, nothing can be mentioned so well adapted to produce in us a determination to be good men. May this be your determination this night, here in the sanctuary of God, in the society of the companions of your youth, in the presence of venerated friends, in that future all unknown, stretching before you ! Whatever you may be, whatever destiny you may experience, you will act in the spirit of that renowned man who, in the midst of the heaviest trials that ever befell mortal, declared : "All the while my breath is in me, and the Spirit of God is in my nostrils; my lips shall not speak wickedness, nor my tongue utter deceit. God forbid that I should justify the wicked ; till I die I will not remove mine integrity from me. My righteousness I hold fast, and will not let it go. My heart shall not reproach me so long as I live." That God who made, who redeemed, who has thus far preserved and given to you blessings numerous and great, who has distinguished you above many of your fellow-men, putting in his claims, designates the course which we have indicated as the only one suitable for you, the only one which He can approve, the only one which will enable you to attain true blessedness. Listening to that voice which comes to us from the throne of the universe, and admiring its condescending grace, in directing our steps, let us give ourselves up to its guidance, that we may secure to ourselves the good to which it invites, and attain the glory which it makes known as our inheritance. God, the Saviour of the young, who askest their hearts, incline their hearts to a favorable response to their own most gracious invitation !

We ought not to forget the special dealings of God with you. Although in number greater as a class than those which have preceded you, nevertheless, your number has been more diminished by death than that of any other class.

Of those who were your immediate associates, in study, and looked forward to a participation in the honors of completed education with you, three have been summoned to the eternal world. Uhl and Albert and Heinard are not here. Cut down in the morning of life, they have gone into the presence of their Judge, and leave you here to prosecute your probation. Early removed, we entertain the hope that they were not unprepared. We trust that death has been gain to them. But how solemn the warning to you, how impressive the appeal of their God and yours, and how urgent the call to you, to be ready to live the life of the good man, that his end may be yours. Indeed has God taken special interest in your spiritual welfare, and given you most affecting motives to induce you to be true to your own interests, and to be followers of them who through faith and patience inherit the promises.

Now, young gentlemen, we have spoken to you, we trust plainly, certainly with sincerity, our parting words, our last affectionate counsel. Go with our best wishes, our prayers for your good! Go determined to live the life of good men! Seek first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all will be well with you—every blessing will be yours—you will be happy here, you will be happy hereafter!

ARTICLE VI.

ISRAEL UNDER THE SECOND GREAT MONARCHY.

By Rev. R. Hill, A. M., Pittsburgh, Pa.

No. II.

ARTAXERXES LONGIMANUS. (B. C. 464—424.)

THE name Artaxerxes, it may be observed, is compounded of *arta* and *xerxes*, the former of which, it is said, means honored, and the latter, king. Longimanus, every one knows, signifies long-handed. So that this monarch is distinguished by the double appellation of the honored and long-handed King. He bears the latter title, either because of the extent of his dominion—the arm of his power reaching so far—or as some say, his natural arms were much longer than those

of ordinary persons, or as others affirm, his right arm was longer than the other.

Artabanus, who had long been Captain of the king's guard, and a man of high authority under Xerxes, observing the luxury and consequent imbecility of his master, determined to make an effort to usurp for himself and family the royal dignity of Persia. Accordingly, he went to the apartment of the king, with hired assassins, at midnight, and murdered him in his bed. Running hastily to Artaxerxes, the third son, he abruptly informed him of his father's death, at the same time charging the infamous deed upon Darius, his eldest brother, stating that the motive which urged to the wicked patricide was, doubtless, to place himself upon the throne. Upon this information, Artaxerxes rushed into his brother's bed-chamber and, as he supposed, revenged his father's murder, by plunging a dagger to his brother's heart. Artabanus, in order to blind the minds of the people as to his guilt and ultimate design, took Artaxerxes and placed him upon the throne in the room of his father, intending to assassinate him as soon as the proper time for perfecting his plans should arrive. But Artaxerxes, having received timely intelligence concerning the infamous scheme, cut him off before the treason had time to develop itself. Thus did this prince establish himself upon the throne of his fathers, where he continued to rule with comparative wisdom and justice, for more than forty years.

In person, he is said to have been the handsomest man of his time, and in disposition, mild, amiable and generous.

Although actual hostilities between the Greeks and Persians had for some years ceased, yet there was still lurking in the hearts of the former, a strong desire to avenge real or supposed wrongs which they had suffered from the latter. Hence, when Egypt manifested a disposition to rebel under Inarus, in the fifth year of Artaxerxes, the Athenians were prompt to come to their assistance. When information of this rebellion came to the ears of Artaxerxes, he immediately fitted out an expedition for its suppression, and gave it into the hands of his brother Achaemenides. The result of this campaign was, that the Greeks took, and almost destroyed the Persian fleet, and uniting their forces with those of Inarus, killed one hundred thousand Persians, together with Achaemenides himself, in a great battle near the Nile. Those who escaped death in the battle, fled to Memphis, where they shut themselves up in what was called the White Wall, where

having sustained a siege of three years, they were relieved by new forces from home.

These new forces were sent under the command of Artabazas and Megabyzus, governors of Cilicia and Syria, both faithful friends and ardent supporters of the king.

The forces of this new expedition against Egypt consisted of a large fleet and a great army on land, the former of which was under the command of Artabazus, and the latter under that of Megabyzus. The one sailed directly for the Nile, while the other made his way by land to Memphis, and raised the siege of the White Wall. Having united the Persian forces, he gave battle to Inarus, and triumphed with great slaughter of the revolters and their Grecian allies. Finally the Greeks were entirely driven from Egypt, having lost much, both by land and sea, through their gratuitous assistance of the rebels. The rebellion was crushed, and Egypt returned to her former submission to the Persian crown, and so remained, peacefully, until the death of Artaxerxes. But the Greeks could not brook a failure like this. Having equipped a fleet, and placed Cimon at its head, they sent him to Cyprus and the coasts of Syria and Cilicia, to harass and injure the Persians, in which object he succeeded so well, that Artaxerxes agreed to a peace which considerably curtailed his dominions. But on the other hand, the Greeks agreed never again to invade his territory. When this treaty was concluded, the enmity between the Greeks and Persians ceased, as also the war which, commencing with the burning of Sardis, had now continued almost through two generations.

Artaxerxes was now at peace with all foreign nations. But scarcely had quiet settled upon his dominions, when he was suddenly plunged into a domestic war with his best friend, Megabyzus. In this war, we have a striking illustration of how much just and upright men may be injured by giving heed to the counsel of evil and wicked advisers. Inarus the Egyptian rebel, and the leaders of his Athenian allies, delivered themselves up to Megabyzus, on condition that their lives should be safe, of which he assured them, by pledging both his own private honor, and the public faith of his country. After the settlement of the Grecian troubles, Hamestris, the mother of Artaxerxes, a very unprincipled and blood-thirsty woman, was continually soliciting the king to deliver over to her the prisoners already mentioned, in order that she might wreak her vengeance upon them for the death of her son Achaemenides, who fell in the African war.

For years he manfully resisted these passionate entreaties. But at last, in an unfortunate moment, he yielded a reluctant consent, and the poor prisoners, relying for life on the terms of the treaty, were cruelly tortured, and miserably put to death. By this act of perfidy, Megabyzus considered himself, as a public functionary, greatly disgraced, and so deeply did he feel upon the subject, that, disregarding his allegiance to Artaxerxes, he raised the standard of revolt, and plunged the country into all the horrors of a protracted civil war. Army after army of the king was destroyed, until finally, through the persuasions of the wife of Megabyzus, who was the sister of Artaxerxes, the former was appeased, and peace and mutual confidence again restored.

About the thirty-fourth year of Artaxerxes' reign, commenced the first Peloponnesian war among the Greeks, in which Persia took no active part, though often solicited by both the contending parties. At the same period, a terrible pestilence visited the world, by which the dominions of Artaxerxes suffered greatly, in common with many other countries. When this plague was raging, Longimanus is said to have invited Hippocrates, the greatest physician of antiquity, to his court, but no entreaties nor rewards of fame or wealth could lead him to forsake his kindred and his native city, and leave them in distress.

Artaxerxes died a natural and peaceful death, in the forty-first year of his reign, and was followed on the throne by his only legitimate son, Xerxes.

EZRA. (B. C. 458—445)

Many years had now elapsed since Zerubbabel and Joshua came to Jerusalem with a decree from Cyrus, authorizing them to rebuild the Temple. These virtuous and worthy leaders of the people had, doubtless, long since been gathered to their fathers. Nor is there any more mention of the names of Haggai and Zechariah, divinely commissioned to instruct the multitude. How rapidly might we suppose the Jews, so recently returned from bondage, would degenerate when destitute of religious leaders, for the heart without instruction—

“Like a pile without inhabitant, to ruin runs.”

We are not surprised then, to find Jerusalem, although blessed with the Temple, and at least a show of Temple service, yet almost in ruins. Though sixty years returned from

bondage, the inhabitants of the Holy City were little better provided for than their captive brethren in the land of Babylon. But how good is God to his chosen! How sure are his decrees of mercy to the oppressed! He had intimated (Dan. 9: 25) that a commandment should go forth to restore and build Jerusalem, and now, in the seventh year of Artaxerxes, the set time had fully come. He who was made instrumental in the hands of God, of obtaining and executing this decree, was Ezra, who was a descendant of Seraiah (Ez. 7: 1) the high priest, who was put to death by the king of Babylon when he sacked Jerusalem, (2 Kings 25: 18) and hence a descendant also of Aaron. Nor could a fitter instrument have been chosen, for he was a man of great learning, constant piety and holy zeal. "He was a ready scribe in the law of Moses," (Ezra 7: 6) and "He prepared his heart to seek the law of the Lord and to do it" (Ezra 7: 10). It is not possible to ascertain what relations this eminent servant of God sustained to the king of Persia; but it is quite probable that, like Nehemiah, his successor, he was the incumbent of some honorable office. For he seems to have met with no difficulty in procuring permission to go up to Judah and Jerusalem. (Ezra 7: 11.)

The commission which Ezra carried with him was very ample and complete, and highly honorable, both to him who granted and him who received it. It grants permission to all Israelites in the Persian dominions, who had the desire, to return to their native land. It authorized Ezra to inquire into the government of all Judah and Jerusalem; appoint judges and magistrates, and administer the government according to his own discretion, only so as to meet the requirements of the "law of God," (Ez. 7: 14.) It makes provision for all the expenses to come out of the king's treasury. In a word, it establishes the Jewish nation as a separate people, with their own governor, judges and magistrates. Well might Ezra bless God (7: 27) for such distinguished favors, and well might the people flock in crowds to the standard of him who had authority to lead them to the home of their fathers. It seems a matter of surprise that, after the decree of emancipation was fully announced, and the ensign of the expedition set up, and the rendezvous appointed, and all things ready for the journey, but little more than one thousand males were willing to sacrifice comparative ease and comfort to duty and religion. But how much more are we

surprised to discover, when the review is made at Ahava (Ezra 8: 15) that not one of the sons of Levi was in the company. The sacred tribe, specially set apart for the service of religion, who should have felt the deepest interest in the good cause, were last in zeal for the house of God, nay, they seem to have been entirely wanting.

But Ezra is going to establish the temple service in Jerusalem, and without Levites the work cannot be done. He is therefore compelled to send out chosen men to beat up recruits among the indolent and lukewarm priesthood, that he might have ministers for the house of God. (Ezra 8: 16.)

By dint of arduous labor and faithful argument, forty Levites and two hundred and twenty Nethinim were at last persuaded to accompany the expedition. And now all things are ready. Let the journey be commenced with all possible dispatch consistent with safety and propriety. But stay; there are many dangers by the way, enemies on every side, marauders, land-pirates and robbers, against whom no provision has been made. And Ezra was ashamed to ask a military guard from the king, for he said that God would be a guard to them that seek him, and show his wrath against them that forsake him. (Ezra 8: 22.) And now the piety he had professed is put to a practical test; nor does it fail in the trial. He had full confidence in the protecting power of the God he worshipped; hence a general fast is proclaimed at Ahava, and all the multitude afflict themselves and unite in an earnest prayer that God would preserve them, their little ones, and their substance (21), and the petition was mercifully heard and graciously answered.

The preliminary steps being thus taken, and the preparations all completed, they departed from Ahava, on the twelfth day of the first month, to go to Jerusalem, and after a journey of four months, in which the highest prosperity attended them (8: 31) they rejoiced at beholding the holy temple and the city of their fathers. But however great might have been the first joyous impulse in the heart of Ezra, it was soon dissipated when he commenced the execution of his mission. On inquiry, he discovered that the returned Jews were but little better than the heathen around them. Illegal intermarriages with the aliens, was the great prevailing iniquity, by which the identity of God's chosen people was jeopardized, and the holy seed contaminated. Nor was this the case among the masses of the people alone; the priests and Levites, and highest rulers, were chief in the trespass.

Astonished, confounded, and deeply humiliated, the pious leader of the liberated captives, falls down before his God, and in shame for Israel rends his garments and plucks off the hair of his head. Then rising up, he offers a most touching prayer, acknowledges the goodness of God to the people, confesses their heinous sin, and beseeches pardon and deliverance.

The earnestness and zeal of this servant of God attracted the attention of the people, and upon reflection, they themselves became deeply penitent and fearful of Heaven's just and righteous judgments. Many came, and of their own accord proposed to give up their strange wives. All the chief men took a solemn oath to use their best endeavors to rid the land of this nefarious evil (10: 1—5). Ezra summoned all the people together in one place, for the purpose of taking steps to complete the reformation. Each man came, on penalty of the confiscation of his goods. This mode was found impracticable on account of the multitude, so that they were again permitted to return to their homes, and two judges appointed to try each case separately (10: 15). During the period of three months, they sat daily, adjudicating case after case, until they "made an end with all the men that had taken strange wives." The evil seemed to them to be entirely removed, but it is hard to work a thorough reformation when corruption is once introduced. Nehemiah complains of the same sin years afterwards (13: 23), and Malachi declares that "Judah hath profaned the holiness of the Lord, and hath married the daughter of a strange God." (2: 11.) Nothing further is said of the condition of the Jews, either political or religious, until the twentieth year of Artaxerxes, when Ezra's commission was superseded by one granted to his successor. Yet his zeal for his people and his religion, did not grow less fervent, for under the government of Nehemiah (8) he appears as a priest, reading and expounding the law publicly, from morning until noon. After having spent a long and useful life in the service of God and his fellow-men, he died and was buried, as some say, at Jerusalem, or as others affirm, in Persia.

THE OLD TESTAMENT CANON.

As little is recorded concerning the administration of the government by Ezra, so it is probable that but little was actually done by him towards outward reform, except in the case already mentioned of illegal marriages. The cause of

this may be found in the fact that his mind and energies were employed in that most important and extensive work of settling, arranging and correcting the canon of Scripture. This step was doubtless found necessary, in order to the carrying out of the specifications of his commission, which required him to reform and establish everything according to "the law of God." But how could this be done without determining definitely what this law was, and having it in a convenient form for reference. Feeling this to be a necessity, the ready scribe and devout admirer of the law, devoted himself to the work, for which he has ever since been held in just and revered remembrance, both by Jews and Christians.

From the destruction of Jerusalem to the date of Ezra's commission is one hundred and forty-eight years, during which period the Children of Israel were in bondage, or what was little better, in a state of vassalage, without any fixed form of government of their own. In this state of things it seems wonderful that the sacred books were preserved at all, and we should look upon that preservation as nothing short of a miracle of divine beneficence.

The dictates of inspired truth, as they came to Ezra must, from the nature of the circumstances, have been in detached portions, filled with the mistakes and interpolations of numerous transcribers, and doubtless mingled with a host of spurious documents, claiming for themselves the honor and authority of the law of God. To produce out of this heterogeneous and imperfect mass of manuscript, a complete, uncontaminated and well authenticated copy of the Word of God, would necessarily comprehend the anxious, earnest toil of years. After having collected together all the books that lay claim to inspiration, he selected from them those only whose claim could be justified. The next step was to arrange them in their proper historical order. But in many places, transcribers, by mistake or otherwise, had omitted important points, or added matter of their own, which must be expunged and restored. In Ezra's copy of the Bible was introduced what was necessary for the illustration and the clearer apprehension of the meaning; such as what is related concerning the death and burial of Moses in Deuteronomy. In order to accomplish such a work with such materials before him, it would require him to write the whole over a number of times.

We are not surprised then, at the result of his labors, as governor, when we consider his duties as scribe of the law, which effectually prepared the way for:—

NEHEMIAH. (B. C. 445—409.)

Nothing is said of the birth or parentage of this great man, except that he was the son of Hachaliah. It is certain, however, that he was born in the captivity, and probable that he was of the tribe of Judah or Levi. Though a captive in a strange land, he attained by his personal virtues and attractions, the highest honor in the court of Artaxerxes, for he was the king's cup-bearer, and his special favorite (Neh. 2 : 2—6). Nor was this estimate of his character above its just measure, as will abundantly appear in his wisdom and energy as a governor, and his zeal as a servant of God.

Ezra, as has been seen, performed the functions of his commission as well as he was able. He instituted the temple service according to the law, and reformed the abuses of the people in their mode of living. But there was much still to be done to make Jerusalem desirable, to "restore and rebuild it." Indeed, the condition of the holy city was in every way deplorable. Help was greatly needed and greatly felt. To secure assistance, very probably, Hananiah and others, with the consent of Ezra, went to the royal city of Persia. Here they fell in with the pious cup-bearer of the king, who anxiously inquires of the welfare of the captives who had escaped. The answer he received was, that they were in great distress, and Jerusalem in shame and ruins.

Deeply grieved at such a tale of distress, he fasts many days, and prays for divine guidance in his resolutions, and divine assistance in their execution. He applies for an appointment as governor of the Jews, and receives authority to go and build the city of his fathers' sepulchres. The king appoints him a retinue and a guard, and sends him to Jerusalem in the twentieth year of his reign.

Having arrived at Jerusalem, Nehemiah showed his letters of authority to the governors of the surrounding provinces, at which they were greatly displeased, and when he announced his intention to proceed with the repair of the wall, they laughed him to scorn. But his trust was in the "God of heaven" (2: 20).

Like a wise builder, Nehemiah carefully considered the work to be done, and spent three days and nights in viewing the ruins of the city and the wall. Then he said to the people: "Come let us build up the wall of Jerusalem, that we be no more a reproach," and the people answered: "Let us rise up and build," and thus the work began. All classes

volunteered their services, from the high priest down to the lowest of the people. The wall was divided into sections of convenient dimensions, and all parts of it carried up at the same time. The priests were put foremost in the work of restoration, and undertook the first division. With such an example there could be no lack of volunteers for the service. Even Nehemiah and his attendants were so entirely engaged, that they never changed their clothing to rest. While the good work was thus rapidly advancing, Sanballat and his co-adjudtors began to deride and say, "What are these despicable Jews about? Do they suppose that they can build a wall? Why if but a fox should climb over it, it would fall." But when they saw it rise, staunch and strong, to half its necessary height, their contempt was turned into the vexation of disappointment, and "they were very wroth." Hence they formed a conspiracy, whose object was, by whatever possible means, to hinder the fortification of Jerusalem. News of this dangerous conspiracy was brought to Nehemiah by certain Jews in the surrounding country, who came and said that the enemy was gathering together from every quarter. To meet this advance of his foes, Nehemiah put arms into the hands of the people, and appealed to them, depending upon the Lord who is great and terrible, to fight for their brethren, their sons and their daughters, their wives and homes. Thus with a weapon in one hand, and an implement of toil in the other, they returned to the work. What a worthy example of devotion is here furnished for the imitation of those who are now engaged in rearing the walls of the spiritual Jerusalem, and the living temple of God.

A new and most distressing hindrance followed the opposition of Sanballat. There was a great dearth in the land, and poverty pressed the people. They mortgaged their lands and houses to provide the necessaries of life. They borrowed money of the nobles at a fearful per centage, to discharge their liabilities. The day of payment came, and they were not able to meet the obligation, hence their homes were about to be sacrificed, and their children sold into bondage for debt. The cry of distress and the wail of woe reached the ear and touched the heart of Israel's pious restorer. Indignant at the reckless advantage the nobles had taken of the necessities of the people to distress them, he confronts the heartless money lenders with their sins, and compels them, by a solemn oath, to remit the interest on all their loans; so that peace and quiet were again restored.

Sanballat seeing that he could not prevail over Nehemiah by strength, sought to accomplish his end by stratagem. First he endeavored to decoy him from Jerusalem, that he might by violence destroy his life, for which intent he sent messenger after messenger, inviting him to a friendly interview without the walls, and at a distance from the city. But seeing the object of the wily solicitor, Nehemiah was too busily engaged in the important work of building the wall, to regard his earnest entreaties with more than a polite refusal. Next, Sanballat resorted to bribery, and hired certain persons in Jerusalem to dampen the courage of Nehemiah. They, seeking to persuade him to abandon his confidence in the protection of the Almighty, endeavored to induce him to shut himself up in the temple, lest he be assassinated in the night. His reply bespeaks no less the force of his indomitable will, than his implicit reliance upon the protection of Heaven, and challenges all history for an example of superior bravery. "Should such a man as I flee? and who is there, that being as I am, would go into the temple to save his life? I will not go in." Being now rid of these execrable opposers, for they dared measure neither strength nor stratagem with such a man as Nehemiah, he proceeded to complete the fortifications of Jerusalem, and the holy city was no longer a reproach among the nations of the earth. Rulers were appointed and strict police regulations adopted (Neh. 7 : 2—3), and a complete reform in the whole government effected, and order was brought out of confusion.

Nehemiah, like a wise, far-seeing legislator, felt the necessity of a general diffusion of knowledge among the people, and more especially that knowledge which maketh wise unto salvation. Hence the whole nation was summoned together (8 : 1) to listen to the voice of the venerable Ezra, as he read the words of the law of God out of the volume which he had compiled and arranged under the directing influences of the Holy Spirit.

So great was the effect of a knowledge of the truth on the minds of the people, that they all "wept when they heard the words of the law." Day after day was this reading and explanation continued, until the nation was prepared for all the reforms required by the law of Moses, which were introduced one after another, and finally the work of the restoration was, in a measure, complete. Nehemiah now thought it safe to fulfil his promise to the king (2 : 6), to return to Susa. But his pious heart still clung to Jerusalem, and he felt a

deep anxiety for the welfare of his brethren. Therefore, in the thirty-second year of Artaxerxes, he sought and obtained permission (13: 6) to return to the land of his fathers, again to take charge of the government. During his absence many abuses had crept into the administration. The temple was defiled (13: 5), the portion of the Levites was withheld (13: 10), the Sabbath was profaned (13: 15), and illegal marriages had taken place (13: 23). To the reformation of these abuses he devoted himself with untiring zeal, and years elapsed before it was fully accomplished. The last act mentioned in verse twenty-eight of chapter thirteen, could not have been performed until some time after the death of Artaxerxes, for it was during the high priesthood of Joiada, who was contemporaneous with Darius Nothus, and not with Artaxerxes. And here closes the account of the self-sacrificing, important and unblemished career of Nehemiah. His work being ended, his mission completed, his pious endeavors crowned with success, he slept with his fathers, probably at Jerusalem, from which his dust shall arise to hear the welcome of his Lord and Master: "Well done, good and faithful servant, thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many."

DANIEL'S SEVENTY WEEKS.

The most important event which transpired in Jewish history, during the reign of Artaxerxes, is, without doubt, the commencement of the seventy prophetic weeks spoken of in the ninth chapter of Daniel (9: 24—27). This prophecy is of the highest importance to the whole Christian world, as it is one of the chief pillars of evidence on which rests the great fabric of the Church of the meek and lowly Jesus. The period of the coming of Messiah the Prince, is here definitely predicted.

The exact number of years is designated, which must intervene between a certain event and the cutting off of the anointed one. If, therefore, we can ascertain the proper commencement of the intervening years, we have but to count over the requisite number, to satisfy ourselves that he who was to come has come, and that those who still await his coming, are indulging in the vain and cruel illusion of a false, unfounded hope. The language of the prophecy is, "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in ever-

lasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the Most Holy.

Know therefore and understand, that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem, unto Messiah the Prince, shall be seven weeks and three score and two weeks: the street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times.

And after three score and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off, but not for himself: and the people of the prince that shall come, shall destroy the city and the sanctuary; and the end thereof shall be with a flood, and unto the end of the war, desolations are determined.

And he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week: and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease, and for the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate, even until the consummation, and that determined shall be poured upon the desolate. (Dan. 9: 24—27.)

The points that claim special attention are: the things to be accomplished; the time given for their accomplishment, and the period whence this time is to be reckoned.

1. That which is to take place, and to be fully effected within a certain time, we find in the twenty-fourth verse. The people of Daniel are no more to be the chosen of the Lord, Jerusalem is no more to be the holy city, transgression is to be finished or restrained; sin is to be ended or sealed up (i. e.), forgiven, reconciliation or expiation is to be made, everlasting righteousness is to be furnished, prophecy concerning Christ is to be sealed up or fulfilled, and the Most Holy is to be anointed or set apart and manifested as the Saviour of mankind.

2. The time that must elapse before this important consummation is expressed by the term, seventy weeks. Now these weeks are doubtless weeks of years, (i. e.) every week embraces a period of seven years, for it is plainly evident that what is predicted was not accomplished within the short space of seventy ordinary weeks, and it is well known that it was quite customary among the Jews to compute the years by Sabbaths or weeks. (Lev. 25: 8.) Hence, multiplying seventy by seven, we have four hundred and ninety years as the period that is to elapse before the work of redemption by the Messiah is to be completed.

3. The epoch from which we are to reckon these four hundred and ninety years is, "the going forth of the command-

ment to restore and build Jerusalem." This took place in the seventh year of Artaxerxes, and Ezra was the bearer of the important commission. It is true that Cyrus, many years previous, issued an order, and sent Zerubbabel to build the temple, but his decree does not answer to the particulars mentioned in the prophecy. The main object in Cyrus' decree was to reconstruct the temple, but this does not enter into the prophecy. The decree here spoken of is to provide for the complete restoration of Jerusalem (i. e.), the people of God, in all their laws and customs, according to the teaching of Moses. But the decree of Cyrus seems not to embrace so much, at least not in its terms, if it does in its object. Therefore, we cannot commence the computation from that time. Nor would it be proper to commence from the decree of Darius Hystaspes, for his was only a confirmation of that of his illustrious predecessor. Nor would it be less improper to date from the commission given to Nehemiah by Artaxerxes in the twentieth year of his reign, for this can only be considered as a supplement to the one given to Ezra twelve years previous.

But there are no more than four on record, and three of them not answering to the prophecy, there can be no doubt that the remaining one, viz., that given by Artaxerxes in the seventh year of his reign, is the commandment from the going forth of which we are to reckon the seventy weeks.

And commencing at this time, the month Nisan, 4256 of the Julian period, and adding four hundred and ninety years, brings us to the 4746th year of the same period, when Jesus of Nazareth was crucified at the feast of the Passover (which always occurred in the month Nisan), in the nineteenth year of Tiberius Cesar. (Luke 3 : 1.)*

One thing to be specially observed in these seventy weeks is their division into three unequal periods. These are, seven weeks, sixty-two weeks, and one week ; or forty-nine years ; four hundred and thirty-four years, and seven years. Certain events are to transpire, either within or at the end of each of these periods. During the first period Jerusalem (i. e.), the government of Judah is to be restored in troublous times.

* John began to preach in the fifteenth year of Tiberius ; but subtracting the three years in which he reigned conjointly with Augustus, which the Evangelist has included in his calculation, we have this event occurring in the twelfth year of the same reign. And if we add seven years, the period from the commencement of John's preaching till the death of Christ, it would place the latter event in the nineteenth year of Tiberius, as history records it.

Could anything be more aptly descriptive of the future difficulties of Ezra and Nehemiah? The opposition of Sanballat, the financial oppression of the nobles, the great drought and loss of the crops, the poverty and wretchedness of the people, the frequent relapses of the whole nation into forbidden customs, and the great difficulty of reformation will entitle them to be called troublous times. The period ends in the fifteenth year of Darius Nothus, about which time it is highly probable that Nehemiah completed his work of reform, by expelling the son of the high priest, and son-in-law of Sanballat. (Neh. 13 : 28.)

At the end of the second period, or the end of the first and second added together (Dan. 9 : 25), shall appear the Messiah as Prince. This is the point at which he commences to rule God's spiritual Israel. Here his kingdom of heaven takes its rise. Now this second period closes in the fifteenth year of Tiberius Cæsar, the same as when the word of the Lord came to John the Baptist in the wilderness of Judea. (Luke 3 : 1.)

And from this time, says the Saviour, (Matt. 11 : 12) the kingdom of heaven, in which he is the Prince, has its commencement.

The third period is reserved for the confirmation of the covenant, and causing the sacrifice and oblation to cease. The former was done by preaching the Gospel through the whole period; the first three years and a half in the person of John the Baptist, and the last three and a half Christ himself. The latter, viz., causing the sacrifice and oblation to cease, was done when Christ offered himself a sacrifice once for all upon the cross of Calvary. The high priest no more enters into the holy of holies, for the veil of the temple is rent, and Jesus, our high priest, has entered into the holiest of all, where he is ever ready to make intercession for us.

Who can read this prophecy and observe its fulfilment to the very letter, and then doubt that Jesus of Nazareth, and no other, is he to whom it refers?

How unaccountable that any who hold the Old Testament Scriptures to be the word of God, yet wait for the coming of the Lord's anointed! How strong a proof of the divine origin of our blessed Christianity have we in this prediction, uttered more than five hundred years before its fulfilment, and yet so completely fulfilled in him whom we obey as our Master, and worship as our Lord!

ARTICLE VII.

EXPOSITION OF REVELATION II: 17.

To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the hidden manna, and will give him a white stone, and in the stone a new name written, which no man knoweth, saving he that receiveth it.

THE general design of this passage is obvious, the general sense plain and intelligible to the reader. The sacred writer means to say, that he, who overcomes difficulties, or is successful in his conflict with sin, in achieving the victory, in subduing the innate corruptions of his heart, and in triumphing over the obstacles that impede his progress in the Divine life, will enjoy a marked distinction, great and inestimable privileges, and be brought into the most intimate and cordial relations with God. The *hidden manna*, the *white stone* and the *new name* may be considered as asserting the same simple idea, that the children of God will be furnished with some special token of the Divine favor, some evidence or pledge to which they can refer to authenticate the relationship which they sustain, and establish the claim by which they are made partakers of Christ's kingdom.

τὸν μάννα τοῦ κεχρυμμένου—The Israelites were sustained by manna in the desert, with miraculous food from the immediate presence of God; *hidden* contains a reference to that which was stored away before the Ark of the Testimony. The expression is symbolical of the enjoyments of the kingdom of heaven, the bread of life, (John 6: 32) of which the manna, hidden in the tabernacle, was a type. The believing Christian is permitted to enjoy all the benefits derived from the sacrifice of the Son of God, the consciousness of pardoned sin, the influence and comforts of the Holy Spirit, unknown to the rest of the world, and life everlasting laid up in Christ; he partakes of the spiritual food designed to quicken and invigorate him, God's grace, by which he will be nourished forever. As the manna of the Tabernacle was so far *hidden*, that it was never seen, except by the High Priest, so the spiritual manna may be regarded as hidden, enjoyed in the heart of the genuine believer, of every saint, whose life is hid with Christ in God. *Vide also 1 Peter 3: 4.*

φίλος λευκός—To this expression a variety of interpretations has been given, and examples, illustrative of its meaning,

have been derived from Hebrew, Greek and Roman customs. $\gamma\gamma\phi\sigma$ means a small stone, one worn smooth by water, a gravel stone, pebble; then, in the various senses, according to the uses to which the Greeks applied such pebble stones—a polished stone, the stone of a gem or ring. According to some, the reference here is to an ancient, judicial custom, when stones or pebbles were used at elections or trials, to indicate the innocence or guilt of the arraigned. When it was intended that the individual should be condemned or rejected, a black stone or pebble was dropped into the urn, and a white one, as a token of absolution or approval. *Vide Ovid Met. Lib. XV. 41.*

*Mos erat antiquus, niceis atrisque lapillis,
His damnare reos, illis absolvere culpe.*

With this exposition, then, the *white stone* would denote the sinner's acquittal from guilt, pardon of sin, justification through Christ.

According to other authorities, allusion is made to the conquerors at the Olympic games, who were not only escorted with great display to their homes, but were also presented with a white stone with their name inscribed, which secured for them a maintenance, during their whole life, at the expense of the public treasury.

It has also been supposed to refer to a practice, that prevailed among the Roman emperors, in the games and spectacles, which they gave to the people, in imitation of the Greeks, of throwing among the populace dice or tokens, with the words *frumentum, servi, vestes, etc.*, inscribed, and whoever was successful in obtaining one of these warrants, received from the imperial family the thing designated. *Vide Juv. 7. 174. Qua vilis tessera venit frumenti.* Also a watchword, a signal, countersign, parole. *Omnibus tesseram dare.*—*Liv. Tessera per castra consule data erat.*—*Ib.* There may be, too, allusion made to the mode adopted among the ancients, of casting lots, in which sometimes *tesserae* or dice, tokens with names written upon them, were employed, and the lot fell to him whose token first came out. The *white stone* was regarded as a symbol of good fortune, favor or prosperity. In the Greek writers, individuals of eminence are said to receive from the gods a $\gamma\gamma\phi\sigma$, a favorable testimonial of character. In this sense, then, it would signify, that the Christian, to whom the *white stone* is said to be given, would enjoy the Divine favor, and receive from the Redeemer some token of good.

But the most plausible explanation of the expression is the reference of it to the *tessera hospitalis*, not unknown to the classical reader, used in ancient times, which was, as has been said, “a sort of *carte blanche*, entitling the person who showed it, to ask for and receive what he might want.” When persons entered into a bond of friendship, or were connected by terms of hospitality, each had some memento or token, a testimonial, which was produced as a proof of friendship, on the occasion of a visit, by which the guest could be recognized by the host, and cordially received. It is to this practice that Plautus alludes in his *Pænulus*. *Vide Act V. S. II. v. 88.*

*Si ita est, tesseram
Conferre, si vis hospitalem, eccam attuli.
* * * * **
Hec mihi hospitalis tessera cum illo fuit.

As travelling, in primitive times, was rendered difficult, in consequence of the want of public entertainment, hospitality was, to a large extent, exercised by private individuals. Those who enjoyed, as well as those who exercised this hospitality, often contracted habits of strong attachment and deep regard for each other. Among the Greeks and Romans it became a well-established custom, to furnish their guest with some particular sign or badge, which was transmitted from father to son, and insured friendship and a kind reception, whenever it was presented. This token was usually a small stone or pebble, cut in half, upon the halves of which the host and the guest mutually inscribed their names, and then interchanged the pieces with each other. The production of the *tessera* was always considered fully adequate to secure hospitality for themselves or their descendants, whenever they travelled again in the same direction, whilst at the same time, these stones were privately kept, and the names written upon them carefully concealed, lest others should claim the privileges, in the place of those for whom they were designed. If at any time the friendship was dissolved, these tokens most probably were broken. Hence the expression in Plautus, *Hic apud nos jam confregisti tesseram.*

*ὄροπα κατέδει—*There is an allusion here to the Oriental custom of conferring new names upon individuals, chosen to positions of dignity and rank. God's favored servants in the Old Testament, were often honored with new names, expressive of delight, and commemorative of some event, as Abram and Joseph, when their circumstances or relations in life were

changed. This new name is a pledge of spiritual favor, the mark of the believer's adoption into God's family. It denotes his title to eternal life, and establishes his right to the peculiar privileges and immunities connected with being a child of God, and an heir of heaven.

οὐδεὶς ἡγετεῖ μηδὲ καμβάων. So wonderful is this token of God's love, that it can only be known and properly appreciated by its possession. When given it seems mysterious to all, except to him upon whom it has been bestowed. To him it is intelligible. Others do not perceive or understand the change that has been effected in the true believer, but he knows in whom he has believed; he has experienced the Scriptural evidences of pardoned sin, joy in the Holy Ghost, peace of mind in believing; he feels that his guilt is cancelled, that he is justified freely; he exhibits in his life the fruits of holy living, and entertains a bright hope of a blissful immortality beyond the grave. No one but the Christian can form any adequate conception of the inestimable value of the "peace of mind which passeth understanding," and of the "joy unspeakable" which he possesses as a pledge of his Redeemer's love. With a full and steadfast reliance on the promises of God, he rests assured that it will be well for him in time, and well for him in eternity, that all things here will work for his highest good, and that "when Christ who is his life shall appear, he will appear with him in glory."

ARTICLE VII.

NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

The Divine Human in the Scriptures. By Tayler Lewis, LL. D., Union College. New York : Robert Carter & Brothers, No. 530 Broadway—1860.

We look upon this as no common book: we welcome it as a most able defence of revealed truth and all its corollaries; most seasonable at this day, when the world, in its imagined wisdom, refuses to know God. The work is the clear expression of the deepest thoughts of a most earnest and logical thinker, who here, with the strength of a giant, grapples with the subtle scepticism and the audacious infidelity of our day, and strangles them in his iron grasp. We think it a pity that, while the

doctrines and theories of our modern sceptics and infidels are here crushed out of all coherence, verisimilitude and vitality, by the simple pressure of clear-seeing reason and sound sense combined with true faith, their votaries cannot, by being severally subjected to a similar process, be, one and all, compelled to confess their profound ignorance, their immeasurable stolidity and their unbounded absurdity and perverseness. We should like to see one of our modern Emersons and Parkers, *it id genus omne*, undertake to confute the logic of this book—*quantus iret salsus per artus sudor!* Its arguments are unanswered. It is pervaded throughout by a profound and genuine philosophy, a sound Scriptural theology, and a humble but strong and living faith. We commend it to the attention of intelligent readers of all classes, to theologians old and young, to all who have doubts to remove, to all who have need of establishing their convictions of the truth of Scripture, and of confirming their belief that "the Lord God Omnipotent reigneth," and that He who spake to men through the prophets and holy men of the Old Covenant, hath spoken unto us by his Son.

Typical Forms and Special Ends in Creation. By Rev. James M'Cosh, LL. D., Professor of Logic and Metaphysics in the Queen's University in Ireland; Author of "The Method of the Divine Government, Physical and Moral," etc. And George Dickie, A. M., M. D., Professor of Natural History in the Queen's University in Ireland; and Author of a number of papers on Zoology and Botany. *Tuāos zai Tēlos.* New York: Robert Carter & Brothers.

This work, although published a few years ago, has only quite recently come under our notice; yet it is not therefore too late to commend it to the candid and serious attention of our readers. The name of Dr. M'Cosh on the title page is a sufficient guarantee of both the soundness and the value of the views advanced in its pages. Dr. M'Cosh is an accomplished writer and a most original and profound thinker, upon whose work on the Divine Government we took occasion, some years ago, to bestow unqualified praise. In the present work he has been aided by a learned colleague, distinguished in a department of science pre-eminently calculated to lead the thoughtful mind to the serious and profitable contemplation of the highest verities that can employ the human understanding. The typological teaching of God in nature are here considered in their analogy to the teachings of the written word in the Old and New Testaments. If Butler, in his celebrated "Treatise," seeks to establish the identity between the style of the Almighty Creator in Revelation and in nature, we have here an important step farther in this department of serious and devout inquiry, an attempt to trace and point out in nature, in the visible works of divine power and wisdom, analog-

gies that lie deeper in the nature of things and reach farther in their bearings upon the most momentous truths and relations, than those so ingeniously unfolded and expounded by Butler. This deep and wonderful Typology, which runs through the entire invisible creation, in its simplest and minutest, in its greatest and most complex works and organisms, exhibiting a glorious unity of plan, and unsearchable ingenuity and wisdom of design, is here traced, unfolded, explained, elucidated and profitably commented upon by most acute, learned and devout men, and no inquirers after truth, no student of the two great volumes which must be read as the transcript of the infinitely intelligent, wise and holy mind, can fail to read this attempt to supply a want in our sacred literature, with profit and delight.

Sermons by the Rev. Grattan Guinness. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers—1860.

This volume contains fifteen sermons by the young Irish preacher, who, moved by an ardent zeal for the conversion of sinners, lately came to our shores, and has been preaching in several of our Atlantic cities, and elsewhere. They are the productions of an earnest and devout spirit, containing nothing new or very striking, but presenting the truths of Scripture with much clearness and power, and assailing the avenues to the consciences and hearts of men with a good deal of straightforward eloquence, with forcible appeals and strong persuasion. They are plain, practical discourses, and may do much good in various quarters.

History of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland. Condensed from the Standard Work of Reid & Killen. By Rev. Samuel D. Alexander. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers—1860.

We have given this volume a very cursory perusal, sufficiently careful, however, to satisfy us of its more than ordinary interest. It contains the substance of the large work of Reid & Killen, a work of fifteen hundred closely printed octavo pages. The narrative here presented can hardly be otherwise than interesting to every Protestant denomination, exhibiting, as it does, in a terse and vigorous style, the persecutions and trials inflicted, during a long course of years, at one time by that most diabolical of all institutions, popery, at another by Protestant prelacy, upon a section of the Presbyterian Church. It is a chapter in ecclesiastical history well worth an attentive perusal, for it teaches by the varied experiences of the past many a lesson which it behooves the Protestant Church well to consider in view of the future that lies before her.

Lectures on the Book of Revelation. By Rev. C. M. Butler, D. D., Rector of Trinity Church, Washington, D. C. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers.

We have read enough of this volume to lead us to the conclusion that we may safely recommend it to our readers as an instructive and edifying production. Its theme is one with regard to which the Church is now divided and, to some degree, distracted by a variety of conflicting views; views, many of which we look upon as in the last degree absurd and mischievous. We have certified ourselves that it steers clear of that baseless chiliasm which teaches the personal reign of Christ upon earth during a thousand years: a doctrine which involves many gross contradictions to truths distinctly revealed in Scripture, and a variety of palpable inconsistencies which no ingenuity of special pleading can reconcile. The work appears to be a simple exhibition of the results thus far reached by the most acute and judicious critics as regards the meaning of the prophecies contained in the Apocalypse, and of the views entertained by intelligent christians generally respecting those mysteries of Revelation: we have discovered no vagaries; no system building utterly unwarranted by the plain language of Scripture, but have found an unpretending exposition of what seems to be the general sense of the prophetic word, and as such its perusal may be instructive and profitable to all classes of readers.

The life of Daniel Wilson, D. D., Bishop of Calcutta and Metropolitan of India. By Josiah Bateman, M. A., Rector of North Cray, Kent; his son-in-law, and first Chaplain. With portraits, maps and illustrations. Boston: Gould & Lincoln, 59 Washington St.—1860.

We have long known Bishop Wilson's character as a minister of Jesus Christ, and have followed him in his career both in England and India. He has always stood high with us as a christian divine. Talent, learning, piety, zeal, energy displayed through a long life, set forth in this large volume, embracing his life and a vast amount of collateral matter of great interest make his career deserving of the attention of christians, and particularly christian ministers. We recommend this volume very cordially.

Illustrations of Scripture; suggested by a tour through the Holy Land. By Horatio B. Hackett, D. D., Professor of Biblical Literature in Newton Theological Institution. New and Revised Edition. Boston: Gould & Lincoln, 59 Washington Street—1860.

A very instructive and delightful volume. An intelligent and christian eye-witness selects facts and incidents to illustrate the Sacred Scrip-

tures, introducing large quotations from them. He is eminently successful and happy, and we can promise the reader of his volume a delightful and remunerative labor.

Morning Hours in Patmos, the opening vision of the Apocalypse, and Christ's Epistles to the seven Churches of Asia. By A. C. Thompson, Author of "The Better Land," "Gathered Lillies," &c. Boston: Gould & Lincoln.

A series of practical meditations, combined with much historic matter of interest in regard to the Seven Churches of Asia. No one can fail to read it with profit, whose heart is in unison with true religion.

The Signet Ring, and other gems from the Dutch of the Rev. J. De Liefde. Boston: Gould & Lincoln, Washington Street—1860.

The Signet Ring, the inheritance and the journey to obtain it, and the shipwrecked traveller, narratives religious and moral in their tendency, tastefully drawn and delightful in the perusal.

A Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, by Martin Luther, to which is prefixed Tischer's life of Luther, abridged. A short sketch of the life of Zwingli; as also on the glorious Reformation. By S. S. Schmucker, D. D. Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co.—1860.

Luther on the Galatians, widely known, admired by christians of all denominations, an unrivalled defence of the *articulus stantis vel cadentis ecclesie*, worthy the best translation that could be given it, with other valuable matter, is offered the public in this new impression.

Elements of Popular Theology, with occasional reference to the Doctrines of the Reformation as avowed before the Diet of Augsburg, in 1530. Designed chiefly for private christians and theological students. To which are added the Formula of Government and Discipline of the American Lutheran Church; a tabular view of the Theologians and Theological Literature of Germany since the Reformation; and a dissertation on the mode of the Saviour's Presence in the Eucharist. By S. S. Schmucker, D. D., Professor of Christian Theology in the Theological Seminary of the General Synod of the Lutheran Church, Gettysburg, Pa. Ninth Edition, Enlarged. Philadelphia: Published by Smith, English & Co.—1860.

A work so well known in our denomination, in its ninth edition, containing the mature views of the veteran Theologian who has so long

stood at the head of our leading Theological Seminary, will necessarily be much in request.

Christianity in the first Century, or the New Birth of the Social life of Man through the rising of Christianity. By Chr. Hoffman, Inspector of the Evangelical School in Salon, near Ludwigsburg. Translated from the German. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 58 George Street. Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co.—1860.

"These Lectures were delivered in the winter months of 1853, first at Ludwigsburg, afterwards at Stuttgart. They excited a lively interest, and are now, at the request of many who attended them, committed to the press." Interesting and instructive from the pen of a well-known German Divine, they cannot fail to attract attention, and to reward a careful perusal.

History of the Christian Church to the Reformation, from the German of Professor Kurtz. With Emendations and additions. By the Rev. Alfred Edersheim, Ph. D., author of "History of the Jewish nation." Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street—1860.

We have long desired to see this work of our eminent Historian, Kurtz of Dorpat, in an English dress. It is an admirable manual of Church History, and well adapted for use as a text book in our Theological Seminaries. With the translation, so far as we have examined it, we have no fault to find. Additional matter to render it better adapted to our public, marked as such, is not to be rejected, but we must enter our protest against all the liberties taken with the peculiar views (Lutheran) of the author. Let us have no expurgated editions of this kind.

Smith, English & Co., have completed their edition of Stier's Discourses, and offer it for sale at a reduced price. It was our intention to give an extended notice of this great work in our present number, but omit it for want of room. Its merits are, however, well known.

Hymns for Sunday Schools, published by order of the General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. Philadelphia: Lutheran Board of Publication, No. 42, North Ninth Street.

An appendix contains fifty Hymns for infants, to be had separately likewise. Intrinsically excellent, classified with a reference to Lutheran peculiarities, copious in number, issued by the highest Church authority, this book claims introduction into the Churches of the General Synod. Such a result would be a step towards uniformity so desirable.

Sermons on some of the fundamental principles of the Gospel. By Rev. George B. Miller, D. D., Professor of Theology in the Seminary of the Evangelical Lutheran Church at Hartwick, Otsego county, New York. With an introduction by Rev. William D. Strobel, D. D. New York: N. Tibbals & Co., 118 Nassau Street. Philadelphia: Lutheran Publication House, No. 42 North Ninth Street. Baltimore: T. Newton Kurtz, No. 151 Pratt Street—1860.

Dr. Miller stands deservedly high in our Church in this country, both for learning and piety. The services which he has rendered in the most disinterested manner, are invaluable. The productions of his pen, given to the public, have not been numerous, though we must believe that he has much in manuscript, which the Church would thankfully receive. The volume of sermons now published, introduced by a judicious preface from the pen of Dr. Strobel has come to hand. We have read a few and accord them high praise. Chaste in style, regular in construction, evangelical in tone and withal with a high degree of unction, they cannot fail to be popular and to exert a beneficial influence. We hope to be able, for they deserve it, to give them hereafter a more extended notice.

Christian Liberty in its relation to the usages of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, the substance of two sermons delivered in St. Mark's Evangelical Lutheran Church, Philadelphia, March 25th, 1860. By Rev. Charles P. Krauth, D. D. Published by request. Philadelphia: Henry B. Ashmead—1860.

Dr. Krauth of Philadelphia is well known as a faithful pastor, an accomplished scholar and an eloquent preacher. These discourses on the maintenance and defence of Christian Liberty will not detract from the high reputation he enjoys. We regard them as among the ablest productions of his gifted and graceful pen. The subject discussed, is one of importance, and the positions assumed are sustained by the practice of our venerable Church. The discussion presents a simple, lucid, earnest exhibition of important principles, and abounds in passages of great beauty and force, expressed in chaste, vigorous and eloquent diction.

The Puritans: or the Church, Court and Parliament of England, during the reigns of Edward VI and Queen Elizabeth. By Samuel Hopkins. In three volumes. Vol. II. Boston: Gould & Lincoln—1860

We have, in a former number of the Review, expressed a favorable opinion of this highly interesting work, which possesses all the attrac-

tion of an historical romance or dramatic poem. The second volume fully sustains the interest of its predecessor; if it is not more fascinating. To the author may be justly assigned a prominent place among our American historians, who have done so much towards elevating our national literature.

Science in Theology: Sermons preached in St. Mary's, Oxford, before the University. By Adam S. Farrar, M. A. etc., etc. Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co.—1860.

This volume consists of nine discourses on the following subjects: The gradual discovery of the Divine Attributes through Scripture and Science—Divine Providence in General Laws—Divine Benevolence in the Economy of Pain—Jewish Interpretation of Prophecy—The Doctrine of the Holy Trinity—The Atonement—Laws in the Life Spiritual—The Gifts of the Holy Spirit—Providence in Political Revolutions. The discussions indicate vigor of thought, learning and marked ability. Those who are fond of substantial and nutritive food, will have their desires gratified in the perusal of the work.

The Year of Grace: A History of the Revival in Ireland. A. D., 1859. By the Rev. William Gibson, Professor of Queen's College, Belfast, and Moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland. With an Introduction by Baron Stow, D. D. Boston: Gould & Lincoln—1860.

This is an interesting, impartial and reliable narrative of the Great Irish Revival, which has attracted so much attention. The writer is regarded on all sides as well qualified for the task undertaken, and as having "executed the service with signal ability and fidelity." His opinions are "the results of extensive observation, careful comparison and a conscientious regard to the honor of spiritual religion."

A Familiar Compend of Geology for the School and Family. By A. M. Hillside, Philadelphia. James Challen & Son. 1860.

This is an admirable introduction to the study of geology, which is now regarded as an important branch of a liberal education. It has received the endorsement of Professors Hitchcock, Guyot, Allen, Trego and other prominent instructors, and may be used with great profit as a text-book in our schools of learning.